

SENATE—Tuesday, September 7, 1993

The Senate met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable WENDELL H. FORD, a Senator from the State of Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Today's prayer will be offered by the Reverend Richard C. Halverson, Jr., D.D., of Falls Church, VA.

PRAYER

The guest Chaplain, the Reverend Richard C. Halverson, Jr., D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray:

**** God is love.—I John 4:8.*

Eternal God, our gracious Father in Heaven, cover the U.S. Senate with Your grace and mercy and peace.

May the Senators be infused with love—the love of God in perfection—unconditional, impartial, and infinite love.

Not that conflict may be avoided, but that in the midst of controversy, love may prevail and overcome differences of opinion.

Lord, let us love one another, for love is of God.

In the name of Him who is incarnate Love. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore [Mr. BYRD].

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, September 7, 1993.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, section 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable WENDELL H. FORD, a Senator from the State of Kentucky, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
President pro tempore.

Mr. FORD, thereupon, assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 10:30 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair, in his capacity as a Senator from the State of Kentucky, suggests the absence of a quorum, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from West Virginia.

LINE-ITEM VETO—XII

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, this is the 12th in my series of speeches on the line-item veto, with particular emphasis on the Roman Constitution and its influence upon our own Constitution. In my last speech on this subject, which was delivered just before the August recess, I spoke of the formulation of the First Triumvirate in 60 B.C.—an unofficial, power-sharing arrangement among Julius Caesar, Marcus Licinius Crassus, and Gneus Pompeius Magnus, or Pompey the great.

I also spoke of the death of Crassus, one of the triumvirs, in 53 B.C., of the crossing of the Rubicon by Caesar in 49, and his defeat of the other triumvir, Pompey, at the battle of Pharsalus, in 48 B.C. I spoke of the battle of Thapsus, the death of Cato, and the rise to the pinnacle of power by Caesar in 46 B.C., when he was made dictator for 10 years.

Mr. President, from July 28, 46 B.C., to March 15, 44 B.C., Julius Caesar ruled the Roman world. His autocratic position rested upon the support of his veterans, the associates who owed their advancement to him, the forces he kept under arms, and the special powers that he derived from the various offices conferred upon him, foremost among which was the dictatorship. Caesar had held the dictatorship for a brief time in 49, and again in 47. In 46 B.C., he was made dictator for 10 years. In 44, he was made dictator for life.

Simultaneously, Caesar was consul. He enjoyed the personal inviolability of the tribunes, and in 46 B.C., he was given the powers of censorship—notice I said he was “given” the powers of the censorship—and other powers not dependent on any office.

For example, he had the sole power over the purse—get that; one man—Caesar—had the sole power over the purse. Advanced ratification was given to all of his future acts and arrangements. Honors to match his extraordinary powers were heaped upon him, partly by his own desire and partly by

the servility and fulsome flattery of the Senate. He was given the title Father of His Country, his statue was placed among those of the Kings of Rome, and the month Quintilis, in which he was born, was renamed Julius, or July, in his honor.

Cicero was the first who proposed that the Senate should give special powers and honors to Caesar, and those who followed contended with each other as to which could pay the most extraordinary compliments to Caesar.

Caesar considered the Republic to be a sham, and it was clear that he had no intention of reviving the Republic, its customs and traditions, or its constitutional elements to their former glory.

In the conduct of the government, Caesar allowed no freedom to the Senate or to the assembly. And although he ostentatiously pretended to take offense at the suggestion that he be given the title of “king,” it was generally believed that he passionately desired it.

Bitter animosity was aroused among many of the old ruling oligarchy, who chafed under the restraints imposed upon them by his autocratic powers, and they resented the degradation of the Senate to the position of a mere advisory council. These feelings were shared by many who had hitherto been active in Caesar's cause, and also by the Republicans, many of whom had become reconciled to him.

Among these disgruntled elements, a conspiracy was formed against the life of the dictator. The originator of the plot was Gaius Cassius Longinus, an ex-Pompeian who had been named praetor by Caesar, and who was joined by Marcus Junius Brutus, another ex-Pompeian, both of whom had fought against Caesar at the battle of Pharsalus and both of whom had been pardoned by him.

Marcus Junius Brutus was reputed to be a descendant of Lucius Junius Brutus, who had led in the expulsion of Tarquin the Proud in 510 B.C., and who had been chosen as the first consul of the newly founded Republic in 509 B.C. Marcus Brutus was also the nephew and son-in-law of Cato the Younger, and was highly regarded by Caesar. It was generally believed that Caesar was the father of Brutus, inasmuch as Caesar had had amorous relations with Servilia, the mother of Brutus, which, according to Plutarch, were in “full bloom,” at about the time Brutus was born.

When Gaius Cassius solicited his friends to join in the conspiracy, they consented on the condition that Brutus would take the lead. They wanted a

man of high reputation to preside over the assassination so that the world would see the deed as having had an honorable purpose.

Cassius was married to the sister of Brutus—Junia—and was a man of violent passions. He possessed a deep aversion to tyrants. As it had been reported that the friends of Caesar designed to move that he be declared king on the calends of March, the first day of the month, Cassius asked Brutus what his intentions would be in that event. Brutus, who would one day remind Cicero that "our ancestors scorned to bear even a gentle master," answered Cassius, according to Plutarch, saying, "It would be my duty, not only to speak against it, but to sacrifice my life for the liberties of Rome." From that point on, the two proceeded to talk with their trusted friends.

Among those who concurred in the plot was another Brutus, Decimus Junius Brutus, surnamed Albinus. It was decided that the assassination would take place at a meeting of the Senate on the ides of March, the 15th day of the month.

Caesar had some suspicions concerning Cassius, says Plutarch, and even said one day to some friends that he did not fear "fat and sleek" men but, rather, feared "pale and lean" ones. Shakespeare has him saying to Antonius:

Let me have men about me that are fat;
Sleek-headed men and such as sleep
o' nights;
Yond' Cassius has a lean and hungry look;
He thinks too much. Such men are dangerous.

A certain soothsayer had forewarned Caesar that a great danger threatened him on the ides of March, and Caesar's friends pressed him to have a bodyguard, but Caesar did not allow it, saying that it was "better to die once than to live always in fear of death." Shakespeare deftly shapes the words of Caesar as he brushes aside Calpurnia's fears for his safety: "Cowards die many times before their deaths. The valiant never taste of death but once."

On the evening before the ides of March, Caesar supped at the house of Marcus Aemilius Lepidus, his Master of the Horse, and as he sat at the table, there arose a question, "What kind of death is best?" Caesar, answering before all others, cried out, "A sudden one."

That night, Calpurnia dreamed that she was weeping over him as she held him, murdered, in her arms. The next morning, she conjured Caesar not to go out that day, but Decimus Brutus, in whom Caesar placed great confidence, had come to escort him to the Senate and prevailed upon him to go.

On the way to the Senate, Artemidorus the Cnidian, who had gotten wind of the conspiracy, approached Caesar with a paper, and pressing up as close as possible to him, said, "Read

this to yourself, and quickly, for it contains matters of great consequence and concern to you."

Caesar took the paper but he was denied the opportunity of reading it, by one thing or another from those around him.

As Caesar entered the Senate house, all of the Senators rose to do him honor. As he took his seat, all of the conspirators came up to his chair and pretended to intercede, along with Tullus Cimber for the recall of his brother from exile. As they continued their importunities, Caesar answered them with a blunt negative and then grew angry. Cimber then, with both hands, pulled Caesar's purple robe off his neck, which was the signal for the attack.

Publius Servilius Casca gave him the first blow—a stroke upon the neck with his dagger. All of the conspirators now drew their daggers, so that, whatever way Caesar turned, he saw nothing but steel gleaming in his face and met nothing but wounds from Cassius, Brutus, and others. Caesar struggled against the assassins, but, it is related by the historian, Suetonius, that Caesar gave up the struggle against his murderers when he saw Brutus among them, exclaiming in Greek, "kai su, teknon?"—"even you, my child?" The Latin version "et tu, Brute?"—"even you, Brutus?"—was made famous by Shakespeare.

Caesar then wrapped his robe around his face, composed himself for death, and yielded to his fate. He expired upon the pedestal of Pompey's statue and dyed it with his blood, so that Pompey seemed to preside over the work of vengeance, to tread his enemy under his feet, and to enjoy his agonies. Caesar died of no less than three and twenty wounds. In all, some 60 Senators had shared in the conspiracy.

Mr. President, the assassination of Julius Caesar was one of the most momentous happenings in the history of the world, and it ended the life of one of the most remarkable men who has ever lived.

Plutarch's words here are particularly penetrating: "Julius Caesar died at the age of 56. His object was sovereign power and authority, which he pursued through innumerable dangers, and by prodigious efforts, he gained it at last. But he reaped no other fruit from it than an empty and invidious title."

Plutarch goes on to say,

It is true that the Divine Power, which conducted him through life, attended him after his death as his avenger; pursued and hunted out the assassins over sea and land; and rested not till there was not a man left, either of those who had dipped their hands in his blood, or of those who gave their sanction to the deed.

Mr. President, we are familiar—through Shakespeare and others—with Mark Anthony's funeral oration and also with the reading of Caesar's will,

which named as his adopted son and successor his grandnephew, Gaius Octavius Caepias, who then took the name Gaius Julius Caesar Octavianus, or Octavian as he is generally known.

In 43 B.C.—the following year—Lepidus, who was now governor of Nearer Spain and of Gallia Narbonensis, or Narbonese Gaul, arranged a conference with Anthony and Octavian which took place on a small islet in a river—Appian calls it the Lavinian River, and another historian calls it the Renus River, but those names have long since changed—that flowed near Mutina, now modern Modena, where they agreed on a joint policy. They declared themselves an executive committee, the Second Triumvirate, with absolute powers for 5 years, for the reconstruction of the Roman state, and divided the provinces among themselves.

The triumvirs—in order to pay their soldiers, build up their coffers, avenge Caesar, and destroy their opponents—sent shock waves throughout Roman society by a proscription that was as cold-blooded and loathsome as that of Sulla, about which I spoke on a previous occasion.

Among their victims were 300 Senators and 2,000 knights. The excuse alleged was the avenging of the murder of Caesar. But the real reasons were the confiscation of wealth and property, in order to raise money for their forthcoming campaign against Brutus and Cassius, and also the destruction of their political enemies.

Throughout town and country, there was terrible panic. The heads of all the victims were displayed on the rostrum in the forum, where it was necessary to bring them to the triumvirs in order to collect the rewards. In the effort to escape, some of the proscribed descended into wells, others into filthy sewers; some sought refuge in chimneys; some died defending themselves against their murderers; and some hanged or starved or drowned themselves. Of those who made their escape, some perished in shipwrecks, ill-luck pursuing them to the last.

Their most famous victim was Cicero. Appian says that Cicero was killed near Capua, but Valerius Maximus says that the scene of that tragedy was Cajeta. Cicero was being carried in a litter by his servants when the assassins came up. Plutarch tells us that Cicero saw Herennius, a centurian, approaching, and ordered his servants to let him down. And placing his hand to his chin, as was his custom to do, he gazed steadfastly upon his murderers.

Herennius dispatched Cicero as he stretched his neck out of the litter to catch the blow; thus, Cicero fell in his 64th year of age. Herennius then cut off Cicero's head, and, in accordance with the command that had previously been given by Antony, also cut off the hand that had written the Philippics, Cicero's orations against Antony.

When these parts of Cicero's body were brought to Rome, Antony was conducting an assembly for the election of magistrates. Overjoyed by the sight of the head and hand of his hated enemy, Antony rewarded Herennius with a bonus amounting to ten times the normal price of 25,000 attic drachmas paid per head.

Cassius Dio Cocceianus, a historian, tells us that Fulvia, wife of Antony, took Cicero's head into her hands, and, after spitefully abusing it and spitting upon it, placed it upon her knees, opened the mouth, and, pulling out the tongue, pierced it with the pins she had used in her hair, all the time uttering many brutal jests.

Antony then ordered that the head and the hand be fastened up over the rostra in the Forum, where Cicero had delivered his Philippics—a sad spectacle to the Roman people, who thought that they did not so much see the face of Cicero as a picture of Antony's soul.

After crushing all resistance in Italy, the triumvirates determined to make war on Brutus and Cassius who, with 19 legions, had taken up a strong position at Philippi, in Northeast Macedonia, and whose fleets dominated the seas. Leaving Lepidus to watch over Rome and Italy, and eluding the republican naval patrols, Antony and Octavian landed in Greece with 28 legions and advanced to Philippi.

Plutarch relates that, when Brutus and Cassius were departing from Asia and on their way to Philippi, Brutus had seen an extraordinary apparition. He was sitting alone in his tent, reading and tending to business, by a dim light and at a late hour. The whole army lay in sleep and in silence, while Brutus, wrapped in meditation, thought he perceived something enter his tent. Turning toward the door, he saw a horrible, monstrous specter standing silently by his side.

"What art thou?" asked Brutus boldly. "Art thou god or man? And what is thy business with me?"

The specter answered him, "I am thy evil genius, Brutus. Thou wilt see me at Philippi," to which Brutus calmly replied, "I will meet thee there."

In the first battle at Philippi, Brutus faced the forces of Octavian, while Cassius was opposite Antony's wing. Brutus was victorious over Octavian, but the left wing, under Cassius, was overcome by Antony. In this circumstance, Brutus failed to relieve Cassius because Brutus knew not that Cassius needed relief. He did not have a little cellular telephone in that day, else Brutus would have known, and the outcome of the battle might have been different.

When Brutus had destroyed the camp of Octavian and could see no sign of Cassius, he sent a large detachment of cavalry to relieve Cassius, who had been forced to retire with a small number to a hill overlooking the plain.

Cassius was nearsighted. He could not see clearly at a distance, but his companions saw a large detachment of horsemen approaching, which Cassius concluded to be the enemy in pursuit of him. He, therefore, sent his faithful friend Titinius to reconnoiter them.

As the cavalry of Brutus saw Cassius's friend approach, some of them leaped from their horses and embraced him, while others came up around him, amidst clashing of arms and expressions of gladness. Cassius mistook what he saw to be the seizure of his loyal friend, Titinius, by the enemy, and he regretted having sent Titinius into the enemy's hands. He then withdrew to an empty tent, accompanied by his freedman, Pindarus, where Cassius killed himself with the same dagger that he had plunged into the veins of Caesar. Cassius died on his birthday.

At the second battle of Philippi, Brutus was defeated. After the battle, he retired to the top of a large rock where he presented his naked sword to his breast, and, with the help of his trusted friend, Strato, fell upon his sword and died.

The Republicans had lost the last great land battle.

Philippi was a decisive victory. It laid the entire Roman world at the victor's feet. To Antony, the real victor, belonged the glory and the major portion of the spoils. As for Lepidus, Antony and Octavian shunted him off to Africa, where he slid into impotence and obscurity.

(Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN assumed the chair.)

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, the pressures of time prevent me from dwelling on the momentous years that transpired between the battles of Philippi and the battle of Actium. Antony had spent several of those years in the east, where he had failed in a campaign against the Parthians, finally limping back to Syria after having lost 20,000 men. He would have lost more men had it not been for his superb generalship and the discipline of his legions.

Antony, meanwhile, had been completely captivated by the personal charm of Cleopatra VII, whom Julius Caesar had established on the Egyptian throne, as Queen. Antony had come to Tarsus—we remember Paul of Tarsus. Antony had come to Tarsus, in Cilicia, where Cleopatra, whom he had previously summoned to explain why she had aided and financed the conspirators, was soon to arrive. Cleopatra arrived in a splendid barge with silvery oars and purple sails. She was all decked out in gorgeous clothes, redolent with exquisite perfumes. Without questioning her past policies, Antony quickly succumbed to the spell of her irresistible charm.

Madam President, the love life of Antony was only a pretext for the struggle between Antony and Octavian.

It is true that Antony had treated his wife Octavia, the sister of Octavian, in a shabby manner. She had been a good and loyal wife, and Antony's rejection and divorce of her were abominable to many Romans, and for Octavian, they constituted a personal insult and an act of war.

The breach between the two rivals constantly widened, and the propaganda machine of Octavian worked overtime, day and night, against Antony and Cleopatra.

It was not easy for as crafty a politician as Octavian to go to war against a man as popular as Antony, with both consuls on his side and half of the Senate. To prove Antony a menace to Rome was a difficult thing to do. But Cleopatra was another matter. Cleopatra was more vulnerable, and against her, Octavian's propaganda machine would more effectively work. Was not that detestable oriental queen plotting to make herself Empress over the Roman world? Had she not been heard to say that she would one day hand down justice from the Capitol? In all of Cleopatra's alleged machinations, Antony was made to appear as her dotting dupe.

Capitalizing on the popular revulsion against Antony, Octavian now moved to mobilize public opinion. He contrived to secure, from the municipalities in Italy and the provinces, an oath of personal allegiance, after which he declared Antony stripped of his Imperium and of his consulate.

Late in the fall of 32 B.C., Octavian declared war. Antony, meanwhile, had sailed for Greece where he took up a strong position at Actium. Militarily, Antony should have won the battle of Actium. He was the superior general, and his land forces were at least the equal of Octavian's. He also had a large naval fleet. But Antony's weaknesses outweighed his strengths. Not one of his admirals was the equal of Marcus Vipsanius Agrippa, Octavian's great naval commander. Moreover, Antony's ships were too heavy and too slow. But, worst of all was the low morale of his forces. His officers detested Cleopatra, and, in private, they cursed Antony for not sending her back to Egypt.

The battle of Actium was fought on September 2, 31 B.C., and is considered to be one of the most famous and decisive battles of the world. Yet, it evidently was a miserable affair and scarcely worthy of the name of battle. It was fought at sea, and only a small number of ships actually were engaged. The land armies never fought at all.

The battle of Actium was decisive and famous only because it marked the end of the republic and foreordained the beginning of the empire.

At the height of the already hopeless battle, Antony caught sight of Cleopatra's ship withdrawing from the contest and heading out to sea. The reason for her precipitous departure is not

known, but the distraught Antony instantly followed his queen—who was the first cause, and now the accomplice, of his ruin. His men, left leaderless, soon succumbed to bewilderment and surrender.

The following year, 30 B.C., Antony committed suicide in Egypt. Shortly thereafter, Cleopatra took her own life. Cleopatra died at age 39. Antony was 47—some say older—when he died.

Shortly before Cleopatra expired, she had had brought to her, concealed in a basket of figs, some poisonous asps. Shakespeare has Cleopatra saying to her faithful lady attendant Iras: "Give me my robe; put on my crown: I have immortal longings in me," after which she presses one of the poisonous asps to her breast, it bites her, and she dies.

Late in the summer of 29 B.C., Octavian returned to Rome in triumph. After a century of civil wars and revolution, Rome was exhausted. Farms had been neglected, much of the countryside had been left desolate, small towns had been deserted, the cities had been besieged and sacked, robbers and gangs had left the streets unsafe, morals had eroded, adulteries and divorces had multiplied, and a shallow sophistication prided itself upon its arrogant cynicism—much of what we see in our own country today.

The Senate by now was little more than a name. It gratefully yielded its powers to one who would plan, accept responsibility, and lead. And out of the collapse of the republic, it was necessary to form a new government that would forge a new order. Step by step, Octavian persuaded—or perhaps I ought to say he graciously permitted—the Senate and the assembly to cede him powers which, in their totality, made him king in everything but name.

Octavian revised the membership of the Senate and expelled some 200 of the more disreputable Senators. In 18 B.C., the process of deflation was continued when he reduced the number of Senators to 600.

On the 13th of January, 27 B.C., Octavian appeared before the purged Senate proclaimed the restoration of the Republic, dramatically offered to give up all of his powers to the Senate and the people, and expressed the desire, at 35 years of age, to retire to private life.

Overwhelmed by the noble gesture, the Senate countered his offer of abdication with its own abdication, restored to him nearly all of his powers, and implored him to continue his guidance of the Roman State.

Three days later, on the 16th of January, 27 B.C., the Roman Senate conferred upon Octavian the title of "Augustus," by which he was henceforth known. It was a term that conveyed no new powers, but was an epithet applicable to the gods and to all things holy, and was well adapted to his ex-

alted position. This term of exalted connotation and religious association made Augustus larger than life and worthy of veneration as a sacred being.

A second title was conferred, that of Imperator, "which, after 27 B.C., Augustus used as a permanent praenomen. The praenomen Imperator, after that time, was the prerogative of every Roman Commander in Chief. From, the term Imperator derived the term Emperor," commonly used today to designate Augustus and his successors.

Augustus was the President of the Senate—the Princeps Senatus—first among Senators. But he was also designated Princeps Civium Romanorum, first among Roman citizens.

From the word "Princeps" arose the term "principate"—to designate the office held by the Princeps, a term which also applies to the system of government which Augustus established for the empire.

In 27 B.C., Augustus established a committee to assist him in preparing the agenda for the meetings of the Senate. The committee consisted of both consuls, a representative of each of the other magistracies, and 15 Senators chosen by lot and rotating every 6 months. Reinforced by members of the imperial family and the equestrian order in 13 A.D., the committee began to assume many of the formal functions belonging to the Senate.

Also in 27 B.C., Augustus created the Praetorian Guard, a permanent corps of nine cohorts, or battalions, each 1,000 strong, of picked soldiers to serve as the Emperor's guards and to accompany the Emperor and his family wherever they went, and also to perform the miscellaneous functions of imperial aides-de-camp.

Three of the cohorts were billeted about the city. The remainder were quartered in nearby towns. For several years, Augustus kept them under his direct control. But in the year 2 B.C., the command was entrusted to two praefecti praetorio, or praetorian prefects.

Lucius Aelius Sejanus was made joint prefect with his father upon the accession of Tiberius in 14 A.D., and was made sole prefect in 16 or 17 A.D. By A.D. 23, Sejanus had succeeded in concentrating all of the guard in one barracks near the Porta Viminalis, from which event dates the political importance of the Praetorian Guard and its commanders.

Caligula increased the number of cohorts to 12, and under Vitellius they grew to 16. Vespasian reverted to 9; Domitian raised the number to 10, where it remained significantly unchanged until the Praetorian Guard was disbanded by Constantine the Great in A.D. 312.

Now, I have mentioned the guard here because, in the future centuries of empire following Augustus, the guard

would prove to be a fertile hotbed for sedition and conspiracy, and would, from time to time, make and break Emperors. As a matter of fact, Sejanus, who had been the first sole prefect, was executed by Tiberius for leading a conspiracy.

In 23 B.C., Augustus reached a new settlement, or understanding, with the Senate. His powers were vastly increased at home and abroad. He was granted the tribunitian power, and was also granted the imperium over the city, over the whole empire, and over the Army. Thus, all of the powers of state were now vested in one man, the Emperor, whose word was law.

The Senate ceded—note the word "ceded," the Senate was not forced to do it—the Senate ceded to Augustus special authority to conclude treaties with foreign powers without submitting them to the Senate or the people for ratification. All incoming magistrates swore an oath to observe all of the Emperor's acts and ordinances, past and future. As the master of the legions he was also their paymaster. He controlled the purse strings of the Roman state, and his was the determining voice in all questions of taxation. Augustus also acquired the appellate jurisdiction, and the habit of "appealing unto Caesar" gradually established the Imperial Court of Appeal as a regular part of the constitution.

Thus, Madam President, in 23 B.C., were forged the two constitutional bases of the principate: The tribunitian power and the proconsular Imperium.

The constitution of the empire dates from the year 23 B.C.; 23 B.C. marks the birth of the Roman Empire, and Augustus apparently recognized its significance, for he dated all future public documents from that year, 23 B.C.

Madam President, the Emperor enjoyed absolute power and authority as a gift of the Senate and the people, technically speaking, but in reality, the wide range and magnitude of his powers and functions were essentially monarchical. Rome, which had been founded by a legendary king, beginning in 753 B.C., and had been ruled by historical kings until 510 B.C., was now, 730 years later, in 23 B.C., governed by an emperor. The Roman Senate which, for almost 5 centuries, controlled the power of the purse and had been the supreme organ under the republic, had voluntarily given up these powers, had become dependent, had become fearful, had lost its nerve and had ceded power, without being forced to do so, to an Emperor. And for the next 499 years, ending in the year 476 A.D., Rome would be governed by Emperor.

Rome had gone the full circle, from king, to republic, to Emperor. But, Madam President, "What's in a name?" That which we call a king, by any other word would be the same.

Madam President, I thank the Chair and yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

THE CHRISTA MCAULIFFE FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM—"I TOUCH THE FUTURE, I TEACH"

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, it is a privilege to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the 66 participants who have completed this year's Christa McAuliffe Fellowship Program.

As a teacher, Christa Corrigan McAuliffe excelled. For years, she taught and inspired her students as few teachers can. She was chosen to be what all great teachers deserve to become—a symbol and model for our whole society. She became an inspiration to all Americans when she was selected to be the first teacher in space. She became an instant heroine, and her life ended much too soon.

To honor her spirit and dedication, the Christa McAuliffe Fellowship Program recognizes outstanding teachers in the States and territories each year. This program was established in 1986 by the Department of Education in conjunction with the Christa Corrigan McAuliffe Center for Education and Teaching Excellence at Framingham State College in her hometown, Framingham, MA. In recognition of the dedication that was the trademark of Christa's McAuliffe's life, these fellows have completed a semester project or year-long project to enhance their own teaching skills and broaden the horizons of education. Their lives personify the hope evident in Christa McAuliffe's statement which remains as the motto of the Christa Corrigan McAuliffe Center: "I touch the future, I teach."

I congratulate the 66 men and women in this year's program for their hard work and commitment. They embody a dedication to their students and their profession, which holds great promise for American education. They are an asset to our Nation, and a fitting tribute to the memory of Christa McAuliffe.

I commend them for the honor they have received and for their admirable contributions to American education, and I ask that a list of the fellows be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHRISTA MCAULIFFE FELLOWS

Judith Barnes, Alabama.
Patricia Jacobson, Alaska.
Cindy M. Peterson, Arizona.
Hugh W. Hill, Jr., Arkansas.
Cynthia Lynn Chun, California.
Walter C. Coleman, California.
Charles Robert Downing, California.
Candice Elaine Musso, Colorado.
Stephen M. Rocketto, Connecticut.
Charlotte B. Hughes, Delaware.
Barbara F. Emerson, District of Columbia.
Chris Carey, Florida.
Katie M. McGrath, Florida.
R. Wesley McCoy, Georgia.

Richard Anthony Young, Hawaii.
Marilee Case Donovan, Idaho.
Lee Robert Marek, Illinois.
Michelle Lavae Cline, Indiana.
Judy M. Christiansen, Iowa.
Becky K. Goodwin, Kansas.
Robert Leonard Barnett, Kentucky.
Donald Ray Thornton, Louisiana.
Molly Schen, Maine.
Mary Jo Messenger, Maryland.
Elaine C. Capobianco, Massachusetts.
Bruce Robert Dean, Massachusetts.
Mary E. Brown, Michigan.
Kris A. Skrutvold, Minnesota.
Vicki Fortson Shirley, Mississippi.
Sheila Denise Perry, Missouri.
Dorothea M. Susag, Montana.
Paul M. Ekberg, Nebraska.
Susan Jane Justad, Nevada.
Donna G. Butler, New Hampshire.
Vivian E. Kean, New Jersey.
Barbara Shimshak, New Jersey.
Jeremiah S.P. Cronin, New Mexico.
Benita Behar Miller, New York.
Fred V. Gillam, New York.
Cary Lane Cockrell, North Carolina.
Janet D. Ward, North Carolina.
Donald L. Hoff, North Dakota.
Emily S. Hoar, Ohio.
Gary D. Sackett, Oklahoma.
Roy W. Chambers, Oregon.
Patricia Oravetz, Pennsylvania.
Daryle Crew Roboch, Pennsylvania.
Jane L. Lancaster, Rhode Island.
Timothy C. Kentopp, South Carolina.
June S. Chase, Tennessee.
Ethan H. Calk, Texas.
Gayle K. Gaston, Texas.
Carolene M. Leibl, Texas.
Sheri Lyn Sohm, Utah.
Thomas William Keck, Vermont.
Amanda Louise May, Virginia.
Becky Austell Freeman, Washington.
Ella Darlene Bell, West Virginia.
John L. Mudore, Wisconsin.
Paul J. Uhren, Wisconsin.
Connie Nerby, Wyoming.
Fa'auisa M. Sotoa, American Samoa.
Joseph A. Gumataotao, Guam.
Patricia K. Fua, Mariana Island.
Lucila De Leon, Puerto Rico.
Kyle J. King-Reynold, Virgin Islands.

IRRESPONSIBLE CONGRESS? HERE IS TODAY'S BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Madam President, as of the close of business on Friday, September 3, the Federal debt stood at \$4,390,740,764,704.03, meaning that on a per capita basis, every man, woman, and child in America owes \$17,093.97 as his or her share of that debt.

AGRICULTURE AND THE NAFTA

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise to address the implications of the proposed North American Free-Trade Agreement, or NAFTA, for American agriculture.

While the Congress was in recess, our trade negotiators completed work on the NAFTA side agreements on environmental and labor issues. The NAFTA with its side agreements is now poised to be sent to Congress for approval.

So far much of the controversy over NAFTA approval has focused on the

House of Representatives. Senate approval is taken by some as a foregone conclusion. Over the recess the suggestion was even made that the Senate should act first—presumably to generate momentum for a tougher House vote.

Before the administration embarks on that course of action, I suggest they take a very careful look at the likely vote in the Senate. To my knowledge, no truly reliable survey of Senators has yet been taken. Those that I have seen contain errors or at least very questionable assumptions on the likely outcome of a vote.

This lack of focus on the Senate extends beyond making loose assumptions about the outcome of a likely vote. The administration, the news media, and those lobbying the issue have as of yet failed to focus on some critical issues of interest to Senators.

As is apparently true in the House, issues of labor costs, the environment, and job displacement in the manufacturing sector will unquestionably be of importance to the Senate. But an issue that has gotten very little attention in the House—agriculture—will be of almost equal importance.

My own informal survey indicates that as many as 15 Senators have indicated that certain agricultural issues will have a critical impact upon their vote on the NAFTA. The agricultural problems most frequently cited involve wheat and sugar and they are the subject of my remarks today.

CANADIAN WHEAT

It will be refreshing to those who have been following the NAFTA debate for sometime to find that the dispute on wheat involves not Mexico, but Canada. Canada and the United States are both major agricultural producers and exporters.

They both maintain farm support programs—though the two programs are quite different. The western Canadian provinces in particular compete directly with northern tier agricultural States, like Washington, Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, and the Dakotas.

In my mind, the ultimate blame for the wheat trade problems that we are now experiencing lies directly at the doorstep of the Bush administration and the Reagan administration before it. Most of the problems we face today trace back to the decision to largely ignore agricultural trade problems in the 1988 United States-Canada Free-Trade Agreement or CFTA.

The CFTA did not cause many of the problems—they have existed for years. But it did fail to address them. And as is often the case inattention has made them worse. In the last several years, Canada has been using some of the loopholes in the CFTA to rob American farmers of markets both here in the United States and in Mexico. There are three separate problems in need of attention.

TRANSPORTATION SUBSIDIES

First, Canadian transportation or Crow's Nest subsidies have become a serious problem. These subsidies have existed since agriculture became a major industry in the western provinces. They amount to the Canadian Government paying the cost of shipping Canadian farmer's crops from field to market. In present market conditions, they sometimes amount to a \$20 per ton subsidy on wheat.

Under the CFTA, our trade negotiators inexplicably agreed to a scheme which banned using these subsidies on shipments into Western States, but allowed them on shipments to Eastern States. Not surprisingly, Canadian shipments of wheat have tripled—from 23 to 75 million bushels in the last 5 years. With almost all the shipments coming into Eastern States.

To the great credit of President Clinton and his Agricultural Secretary Mr. Espy, the Clinton administration appointed a working group to deal with this problem of Canadian wheat trading practices.

It is my understanding that the as yet unreleased report of this working group concludes that these subsidized Canadian shipments of wheat are distorting the United States wheat market and costing the American taxpayers some \$600 million over 4 years in additional farm program costs. There is also concern that some of this Canadian wheat is finding its way into United States farm export programs and is being reexported at taxpayer expense.

But the damage does not end there. The Canadian Government has also used these transportation subsidies in the last 2 years to gain control of almost three-quarters of the Mexican market, a market in which the United States has obvious geographic advantages over Canada.

THE CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD

In addition to transportation subsidies, Canadian wheat exports are also subsidized through a Government operated monopoly known as the Canadian Wheat Board.

Exact information on the prices charged by the wheat board are not released. But it is known that the wheat board charges a high domestic price as in Canada for wheat—sometimes twice the Canadian export price—and uses the profit, that is the profit it gets from higher prices to its domestic consumers to subsidize lower priced export sales.

All exact sales prices are carefully guarded secrets, but those familiar with wheat markets, including experts at the Department of Agriculture, believe that Canada consistently undercuts market prices to undersell the United States.

A CLOSED CANADIAN MARKET

Since Canadian exports to the United States seem to have climbed under the

CFTA, the casual observer might expect a similar increase in United States exports of wheat to Canada. But that is not the case. United States exports of wheat to Canada remain virtually nil.

This is not surprising since they were kept out by the wheat board to keep the Canadian domestic price high. American wheat was first blocked by a flat ban and now by a system of restrictive import licenses and export certificates.

SOLVING THE PROBLEM

Mistakes were made in negotiating the CFTA with regard to wheat and they were not corrected in the NAFTA. But the inequities that burden American farmers can still be remedied in the context of the NAFTA.

The Clinton administration deserves praise for authorizing the use of the U.S. Export Enhancement Program or EEP on sales of United States wheat to Mexico to counter Canadian subsidies. We are doing that now. It is helping. If Canada continues subsidies, we may have no alternative but to fight fire with fire. But there are better ways to address this problem.

The obvious way to address this problem would be for all parties to agree not to use any subsidies on sales within North America. This would certainly be consistent with the spirit of free trade. But when this issue was raised by United States negotiators recently, they were told flatly "no" by their Canadian counterparts.

Privately, Canadian negotiators intimated that the Canadian Government had decided it was better politics to simply oppose the United States than it was to negotiate.

DOLE LETTER

In light of this Canadian refusal, Senator DOLE and I sent a letter to President Salinas 2 months ago suggesting that he employ Mexican unfair trade laws to impose a duty on subsidized Canadian wheat entering Mexico. If such a duty were imposed, the United States could suspend operation of the Export Enhancement Program in Mexico.

We have received as of yet no formal response. But informally American and Mexican wheat growers have been urging their governments to begin action on this front—perhaps by defining practices that they would both consider unfair and countervailable subsidies. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the letter sent by Senator DOLE and myself be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCE,
Washington, DC, July 13, 1993.

President CARLOS SALINAS DE GORTARI,
Palacio Nacional, Patio de Honor, Mexico, D.F.
DEAR PRESIDENT SALINAS DE GORTARI: We write today regarding an issue of mutual

concern. U.S. wheatgrowers remain dissatisfied with the outcome of the 1988 U.S.-Canada Free Trade Agreement (CFTA). Specifically, the continuation of de facto Canadian export subsidies on wheat shipped to the United States and Mexico is not acceptable. Canadian dominance of the Mexican wheat market for the past three years is a direct result of these subsidies.

The CFTA failed to address the use of the Canadian export subsidies on grain bound for Mexico. Section 304(a) of the U.S. implementing legislation for the CFTA directs the President to negotiate an end to these subsidies. However, in the face of Canadian intransigence on this issue, the negotiations have failed. Meanwhile, U.S. wheat producers have faced ever-increasing unfair Canadian competition in the U.S. and Mexican markets.

To address this situation, we urge you to immediately initiate a countervailing duty investigation with regard to Canadian wheat imports into Mexico. This action would indicate a strong desire to guarantee that the North American Free Trade Agreement will provide continent-wide trade, free of export subsidies. We understand that such an action would be strongly supported by Mexican wheat farmers. Failure to address this problem jeopardizes the support for the NAFTA among wheat producers and their congressional representatives.

Resolution of this dispute is of critical importance to both our countries. Failure to launch an investigation leaves no alternative but to use the Export Enhancement Program (EEP) to fight fire with fire. In fact, EEP has already been approved for use in Mexico and could be employed quickly. The resulting price war between the U.S. and Canada would trap Mexican producers in the cross-fire, placing them in a position where they could not compete with the resulting lower prices.

Ultimately, we hope that a satisfactory prohibition on the use of export subsidies between the parties to NAFTA can be negotiated. Only when such an agreement is concluded can the vision of free trade between our countries be realized.

Thank you for your timely consideration of this matter. We look forward to your reply.

Sincerely,

MAX BAUCUS,
BOB DOLE.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, in addition, a provision of United States farm law known as section 22 could help address the Canadian wheat problem. Section 22 is an old provision of U.S. farm law dating back to the Great Depression. It directs the Federal Government to restrict imports of farm commodities if those imports interfere with the operation of the farm program.

As I mentioned, a USDA task force on this problem has concluded that imports of Canadian wheat are interfering with the operation of the United States farm program to the tune of \$600 million per year. That same task force reportedly concludes that Canadian wheat imports should be restricted with section 22.

Undoubtedly, some United States editorial writers and Canada's close friends at the State Department will scream that the United States cannot

use section 22 against Canada. I would remind those likely defenders of Canada of three points.

First, as I mentioned, Canada engages in numerous unfair trade practices regarding wheat, including restricting imports of United States wheat into Canada through a variety of means.

Second, at my urging, the United States specifically retained the right to use section 22 against Canada in both the CFTA and the NAFTA if market changes required it. The current \$600 million annual cost of Canadian imports would clearly qualify.

Finally, the familiar refrain that the United States cannot take action because Canadian elections are right around the corner can already be heard. I find this argument ridiculous. When did the United States Government decide to become active members of Canada's Conservative Party as opposed to supporting other parties or any other party in the country of Canada? I am certainly not prepared to endorse a \$600 million contribution by American taxpayers to their reelection campaign.

END USE CERTIFICATES

One partial solution to this problem that has passed the U.S. Senate twice and the U.S. House on three occasions is end use certificates. These are certificates that would accompany any shipments of wheat into the United States. They would ensure that this imported wheat would not find its way into U.S. export programs to be reexported at taxpayer expense.

End use certificates are a simple good-government provision that should have been invoked long ago. They are employed by Canada and their use here is urged by numerous farm organizations and most recently seven by the Minneapolis Grain Exchange. These certificates are long overdue and must be included in the implementing legislation for the NAFTA.

NEGOTIATIONS

Finally, the only sensible solution to this problem is for both Canada and the United States to forswear use of subsidies and other unfair trade practices on wheat against each other. Perhaps some meaningful action as I have proposed above would convince Canada that the cost of inaction had grown high enough to justify good-faith negotiations.

Later this week, I will send a letter to the administration detailing some of the above measures to redress wheat trade problems. I urge like-minded colleagues to join me in this call on the administration for action.

SUGAR

Many Senators, including myself, have concerns involving potential imports of sugar from Mexico under the NAFTA.

This should be surprising since neither Mexico nor the United States is a

net exporter of sugar. Some sugar is traded between the United States and Mexico, but the trade goes both ways and the volumes involved are small.

But thanks to a negotiating error by the Bush administration a potential hole in the agreement could invite Mexico to switch its domestic soda industry from sugar to corn sweetener and export this artificially created sugar surplus to the United States. Clearly, this shell game would be counter to the spirit of true free trade and must either be addressed with an understanding between the United States and Mexico or through NAFTA implementing legislation. The administration has spoken reassuring words on this problem, but it is now time to back those words with action.

CONCLUSION

As I said at the outset, my own vote counts show that the agricultural issues that I have today raised are critical to the votes of some 15 Senators on the NAFTA.

To the best of my knowledge, more votes in the Senate hinge on resolution of these issues than on any other set of sectoral issues. And if all 15 of these votes were to be lost, the NAFTA would have little chance of winning Senate support.

I hope that this stark reality is finally enough to focus the attention on these issues that they deserve both within the administration and in Mexico. If the President is to win congressional approval of the NAFTA, it will only be through careful attention to issues like agriculture.

WILLIAM P. NAGLE, SR., FOUNDER OF THE HONOR COURT IN NORTHAMPTON, MA

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, it is a privilege to take this opportunity to pay tribute to William P. Nagle, Sr., for his commitment and dedication to the people of Northampton, MA. For many years, Mr. Nagle, who died on March 24, 1993, was the director and driving force behind the Honor Court, a rehabilitation program for alcoholics and drug abusers in the city of Northampton. His leadership enabled the Honor Court to perform counseling, education, and employment assistance to its members while providing a large number of needed public services to the community.

Mr. Nagle was a probation officer for the Hampshire District Court in 1975 when, inspired by his own successful battle against alcoholism, he designed a rehabilitation program for recovering alcoholics involved in the court system. Initially, 100 people were assigned to the program by the judges. Today, over 700 people are enrolled in the Honor Court program and are involved in a variety of worthwhile projects in the city of Northampton.

The Honor Court offers its services 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. These serv-

ices include counseling, transportation to detoxification centers and hospitals, and daily meals for the needy. The program emphasizes the importance of dignity and self-respect among recovering alcoholics. It is founded on the concept that by helping others, individuals can learn to help themselves, and it has been unusually successful in achieving its goals. The program is well-known in the Northampton area for its public services, which include providing holiday dinners for the sick, the elderly, and the needy, refurbishing courtrooms, sweeping streets in downtown Northampton, and maintaining the Honor Court Hotel, which was built by participants in the program and which houses about 20 residents.

Mr. Nagle deserves great credit for his tireless efforts and dedication to this program. Large numbers of individuals have benefited from the variety of services offered by the Honor Court, and the entire community has benefited from the public service initiatives performed by its members. His devotion to the Honor Court and his remarkable efforts on its behalf were outstanding, and his own unusually impressive service to the people of Northampton will be long remembered. I know that Mr. Nagle was proud of his son, William P. Nagle, Jr., who is carrying on the family tradition of service to the community as the elected representative of the people of Northampton in the State legislature.

I ask unanimous consent that an article on William P. Nagle, Sr., and his achievements may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Daily Hampshire Gazette, Mar. 24, 1993]

HONOR COURT FOUNDER DIES: BILL NAGLE, SR., CALLED FIGHTER

(By Rachel Simpson and Judith Kelliher)

NORTHAMPTON.—William P. "Bill" Nagle Sr., 67, a self-described former "falling-down drunk . . . Insane with alcoholism" who became one of the most colorful and controversial men in the city's recent history, died early today.

Mr. Nagle for the past 22 years had directed the Northampton Honor Court, a program he built that helped thousands of recovering alcoholics and drug addicts. While the Honor Court was his love, he was employed officially as an assistant probation officer at the Northampton District Court.

Mr. Nagle was pronounced dead at The Cooley Dickinson Hospital after being taken there by ambulance from his apartment at 76-A Maple St., Florence.

The Pease Funeral Home is in charge of arrangements, which are incomplete.

Mr. Nagle often told stories about how he had risen from the gutter to a position where he counted judges, doctors and other prominent people among his friends. But it was the men of the Honor Court to whom he was most fiercely loyal.

Northampton District Court Judge W. Michael Ryan said today that Mr. Nagle will long be remembered "for his good works and his mighty battles."

Judge Ryan said his memories go back many years to when Mr. Nagle chaired the Northampton Democratic City Committee in the early 1950s.

"He was primarily a fighter. He went from fighting political battles to fighting his own demons," Judge Ryan said. "And when he successfully licked his own problems with alcohol he went to battle for other people."

Judge Ryan said Mr. Nagle had a vision for the Honor Court and an idea of service to the community "and he pushed it."

"He was a mighty warrior and he'd take on everyone if he thought he was right. And he usually thought he was right," the judge said.

Mr. Nagle, who admitted he had a short temper, did not shy away from controversy and he ruffled more than a few feathers.

Although the Honor Court was widely praised for the services it provided—including cleaning downtown streets, maintaining city parks and delivering meals to elderly people—Mr. Nagle's personality also caused him to get into scrapes with city officials from time to time. When officials said or did something he did not like, he sometimes would respond by having the Honor Court temporarily stop its cleaning.

Mr. Nagle was sometimes criticized for his hard-line approach to treating alcoholism. But he also had a loyal following among most Honor Court members who took pride in the holiday meals they served for the public—at no charge—year after year. Last Thanksgiving, 1,900 dinners were served.

Mr. Nagle's work drew attention far and wide. He was named "citizen of the year" by the Greater Northampton Chamber of Commerce in 1988, a few months after he received a letter of recognition from President Ronald Reagan.

In 1991, Mr. Nagle was honored by President George Bush as the 392nd "point of light" for his volunteer work.

Hampshire Family and Probate Court Judge Sean Dunphy today fondly recalled first meeting Mr. Nagle when he would visit the Dunphy house to work with the judge's father, Edwin Dunphy, on city Democratic politics.

"I came to know him myself and we use his Honor Court program for probate and family court all the time," Dunphy said. "I think he'll be remembered as someone who gave so much to others."

William Burke, chief probation officer for Northampton District Court, said Mr. Nagle will be missed by co-workers in the probation office, but more so by the men in the Honor Court program.

"He always looked for the person who was down and out. His heart was as big as a mountain," Mr. Burke said. "I don't think anybody in the country could run the Honor Court program the way he did. He took men and put them back in society and they're great citizens now."

Mayor Mary L. Ford said when she learned of Mr. Nagle's death today she was "immediately aware of what a gaping hole there is now in the community."

The mayor praised Mr. Nagle's "strong leadership and dedication to helping people with addiction problems."

"His way of helping his men, as he called them, was so effective where others failed," she said. "He was loving and cantankerous. We all feel that no one can replace him."

F. Richard Wall, a longtime banker and businessman on Main Street, recalled Nagle as a man who loved Northampton.

"He was a rare man. He had the good of his city at heart at all times," he said.

Mr. Wall said Nagle's legacy will be the Honor Court. "That will be a lasting memorial to Bill, I'm sure."

Mr. Nagle started the Honor Court in 1971, after not having had a drink for five years. He was selling insurance, and at that time W. Michael Ryan was a probation officer who needed help for several teenagers who had been arrested for alcohol-related offenses. Ryan thought Mr. Nagle might be able to help.

That was the beginning of the Honor Court and of Mr. Nagle's work at the courthouse, first as a volunteer and later as an assistant probation officer.

The first Honor Court residence was set up in the Hotel Northampton in 1979. It later was located at 24 Main St. and in a home on Wilson Avenue before moving to its current location at 16 Meadow St., Florence, in 1990.

At one time, Mr. Nagle turned a personal pastime, jogging, into a public service as well, managing to raise several thousand dollars by staging runs for local charities.

In 1982 and 1983, he ran 23 miles to raise money for the hungry and the homeless—running from City Hall down Route 5 toward Easthampton, over Mount Tom to Holyoke and back to Northampton.

Born in Northampton Sept. 30, 1925, he was the son of the late Patrick and Abbie (Keene) Nagle.

Mr. Nagle attended local schools, and for many years worked as an insurance salesman. He had also worked as a labor organizer in the 1950s.

In 1947 at the age of 21 he was elected to the city's former Common Council, where he served three terms.

In 1988 Mr. Nagle was the marshal of the Northampton contingent for the St. Patrick's Day Parade in Holyoke.

Among his children are state Rep. William P. Nagle Jr. of Northampton.

JOHN CHANCELLOR'S COMMENTARY

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Madam President, the Senate returns today for the fall session. This evening millions of Americans, ourselves included, will turn to their television sets to see what the world looks like just now and what seems in prospect. However, for the first time in near to a quarter century, John Chancellor will not be speaking to us from "NBC Nightly News." Joining us, I might better say, for none ever has had his gentle congeniality as he invited us to share his thoughts on the great events of an often terrifying age.

The Senate will perhaps understand that I would as soon not dwell too long on this end of an era. We shall not see his like again; history will not allow that. But it does surely offer the possibility of absorbing the message of his final four broadcasts, and to look forward to many books to come.

Madam President, I ask that these commentaries be printed in the RECORD and that an embossed copy be presented to John Chancellor.

The commentaries follow:

JOHN CHANCELLOR'S COMMENTARY, "NBC NIGHTLY NEWS," TUESDAY, JUNE 29, 1993

When I first came to Europe for NBC News in the 1950s, there were things we believed

very strongly: that the U.S.A. was the unquestioned leader of the non-Communist world; that the Soviet Bloc, which then included China, was very dangerous; that the countries in Western Europe would come together some day as a powerful force; and that Japan would emerge as a stable and important economic power. These beliefs were held for more than a generation. Today, every one of them has been changed. Many people believed Communism would collapse, but no one thought there would be a crisis in the capitalist world, in the world's richest countries, yet that happened. A few years ago, the United States had so little money to fight the war against Iraq that it had to ask other countries to help pay its expenses. Western Europe today is in what some have called a "managed Depression." The political leadership in big major European countries is in deep trouble. Japan's political system has simply exploded, and is being reassembled in the middle of a painful recession. Bill Clinton will be meeting with the leaders of these countries next month, and even with his troubles he'll be in better shape than the others.

The certainties we lived with are certainties no more. The end of the Cold War means much more than just the end of Communism. Washington is redefining the meaning of world leadership. Europe is rethinking the idea of the welfare state. Tokyo is rebuilding an entire party political system. The question of course is, "What happens now?" The answer of course is, "No one knows."

JOHN CHANCELLOR'S COMMENTARY, "NBC NIGHTLY NEWS," WEDNESDAY, JUNE 30, 1993

An alliance is only as good as its parts, but in the case of NATO, it is only as good as the part the United States plays. NATO might not have made it without the Americans. With the Americans, with strong American leadership, NATO kept Europe secure from war for more than 40 years.

So it is sad to report that NATO isn't protecting Europe from war anymore. The people of Bosnia are Europeans, the conflict in Bosnia threatens Europe with a wider war, and a wider war could split NATO right down the middle. There is every reason for NATO involvement, but the alliance has been divided and ineffective since the trouble began in Bosnia 14 months ago.

To a large degree, the United States is responsible for NATO's failure. Listen to what the Supreme Commander of NATO says—a four-star American general named John Shalikashvili. He says NATO's problem is that the United States didn't lead from the beginning. General Shalikashvili says the Bush administration decided two years ago that it would play no active role in resolving the crisis. And the Clinton administration has not been a leader in NATO policy toward Bosnia. The result of this American inaction, according to the Supreme Commander of NATO, is "collective failure".

For President Clinton, being cautious has been popular. Some say Bosnia might be like Viet Nam. Don't get involved.

But it makes you wonder what the United States may do when other nasty crises threaten the peace and security of other allies. Will America's friends get strong American leadership? Maybe not. NATO certainly didn't get it.

JOHN CHANCELLOR'S COMMENTARY, "NBC NIGHTLY NEWS," THURSDAY, JULY 1, 1993

Since I joined NBC News in 1950, the population of the United States has grown by

about 100 million people, believe it or not. And yet, it seems to me that Americans don't spend as much time with each other as they used to. Families used to go downtown to the movies; today, people rent videos and watch them at home, often alone. Shopping malls and big discount chains drive main street shops out of business. So long, mom and pop stores. There are fewer big factories employing thousands of workers. Union membership has declined. More people drive alone in cars than ride on public transportation.

Technology has had a lot to do with it. Television keeps people at home, and has created a huge coast-to-coast take-out food business. More people are working at home. Offices are going out of style. The Wall Street Journal reports that some salesmen are losing their offices; they can send in reports by fax, be reached by pagers, and talk to their bosses through portable computers. No gossiping around the water cooler; no more coffee breaks.

There has been a big increase in communication through online computer networks, electronic mail and bulletin boards, but these people sit at their computer keyboards and never set eyes on each other.

So, there are 100 million more of us than there were 40 years ago, and yet we seem to see less of each other than we did then. I think that's the biggest change I've seen over the years, and it's the change that worries me the most.

JOHN CHANCELLOR'S COMMENTARY, "NBC NIGHTLY NEWS," FRIDAY, JULY 9, 1993

One last word from me.

Years ago, Ben Grauer, who was a distinguished broadcaster for NBC, told me how to behave on the air. He said, "Always remember, you are a guest in their home." It was a privilege to have been in your home all these years. Thanks for your letters, not all of which I was able to answer. Some of those letters, you realize, were not complimentary. That goes with the territory: commentary sometimes works best when it makes people angry.

I owe a great debt to a multitude of colleagues at NBC News, who encouraged me, instructed me and put up with me. I've seen some of them become accomplished broadcasters, and Tom Brokaw is certainly a fine example. It's been a lot of fun. There's a little secret about journalism; we would do it for free, if that were possible, but they actually pay us to do it.

Finally, I want to thank those of you in the audience for your patience, courtesy and hospitality over these many years. It was an honor to have been a guest in your home.

That's commentary. Over to you, now, Tom.

Good luck and good night.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is concluded.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF M. JOYCELYN ELDERS, OF ARKANSAS, TO BE SURGEON GENERAL OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now

go into executive session and proceed to the consideration of the nomination of M. Joycelyn Elders, to be Surgeon General. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of M. Joycelyn Elders, of Arkansas, to be Medical Director in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service and to be Surgeon General of the Public Health Service.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, I understand there is a time limitation; am I correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. There are 8 hours equally divided.

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield myself such time as I may use.

Madam President, I urge the Senate to confirm the nomination of Dr. Joycelyn Elders, to be the Surgeon General of the United States. The Surgeon General is the family doctor to the Nation. Few positions in the Government are more challenging and offer greater opportunity to improve the lives of so many Americans. Disease knows no boundaries of age, race, gender, or class.

Every American child deserves a healthy start in life, but too many children are denied one. Whether the issue is infant mortality or childhood vaccinations, the Nation is failing to fulfill its responsibilities. Drugs, crime, and violence are destroying the lives and shattering the dreams of vast numbers of children. The epidemic of teenage pregnancy is a social and economic tragedy for the country and a personal tragedy for millions of young Americans.

Countless senior citizens are also denied the healthy and secure golden years that should be the reward for a lifetime of hard work. Senior citizens are forced into nursing homes because the care that would enable them to remain in their own homes is unavailable or inaccessible. For Americans of any age, lack of any adequate national strategy for preventive care can often lead to disability and premature death. We need comprehensive health insurance coverage and more effective ways to convince Americans to lead healthier lives and to avoid the self-inflicted wounds of smoking and drug abuse, poor diet, and lack of exercise.

In all areas of health care, it is the poor and minorities who suffer the most. Improving women's health is also a pressing need. A third of all American women do not receive the basic preventive care they need. Breast cancer strikes one in eight women, yet medical research has shortchanged women for decades. Epidemics continue to present serious health care challenges. AIDS threatens many American families and the only cure is prevention. An old killer, tuberculosis, has emerged from decades of neglect as a renewed threat to public health, and

natural disasters, like last year's hurricane and this year's flood, pose major risks to public health in addition to the physical devastation that they cause.

By her record, her character, and her intellect, Dr. Joycelyn Elders is superbly qualified to take on these challenges and to be an outstanding Surgeon General.

Many Members of this body are aware by now of Dr. Elders' courageous life story, her rise from poverty to a career of healing and serving others. But it is a story well worth restating because it shows so clearly the exceptional character of a woman whose nomination we are considering.

Dr. Elders was born to a teenage mother and a sharecropper father in the tiny town of Schaal, AR, 40 miles from Texarkana. She grew up on the family farm in a three-room cabin with her seven brothers and sisters. The cabin had no electricity and no indoor plumbing. As a child, Dr. Elders worked in the fields to help support her family from June through Thanksgiving. School had to give way to work on the farm. Still, she was able to skip two grades, and she graduated as the valedictorian of her segregated high school when she was only 15 years old.

Dr. Elders' mother never had the benefit of prenatal care. In fact, her children were delivered in her home without medical assistance. One of Dr. Elders' earliest memories is of her young brother crying with the pain of a ruptured appendix being taken 10 miles on the back of a mule to the nearest doctor.

Until she went to college, Dr. Elders herself never saw a doctor.

Dr. Elders won a full-tuition scholarship to Philander Smith College in Little Rock. Money was so scarce that her brothers and sisters worked in the fields to help pay her busfare and buy her clothing. She graduated from college magna cum laude in 3 years. She joined the Army in 1953 so that she could earn the right to GI bill assistance to finance her medical education. She and her fellow African-American students at the Arkansas Medical School were forced to eat in a segregated section of the student cafeteria.

Dr. Elders went on to an internship in pediatrics at the University of Minnesota. Because of her ability, she was invited back to the University of Arkansas Medical School to the prestigious position of chief resident in pediatrics. After her internship, she was invited to stay on at the university as a professor of pediatrics. She became a recognized academic expert in her chosen field of pediatric endocrinology, with 150 published papers. In 1987, Governor Clinton named her to lead the Arkansas Department of Public Health.

As a pediatric endocrinologist and professor at the University of Arkansas

Medical School, she was a respected clinician and medical researcher with more than 150 published scientific papers to her credit. In her 6 years as leader of the Arkansas Department of Health, she earned a national reputation as a public health leader with a brilliant record of accomplishment.

In her years with the department of health, she almost doubled the proportion of Arkansas children receiving timely vaccinations. She launched an assault on infant mortality. She increased by tenfold the number of poor children receiving comprehensive health screening. She dramatically expanded cancer detection and treatment services for women. She increased home care opportunities for senior citizens. She led a crusade against the blight of teenage pregnancy. Most of all, she waged a tireless battle to bring better health care to all the children of Arkansas.

In spite of these widely acclaimed accomplishments, Dr. Elders' opponents have left no stone unturned in their unseemly attempt to undermine her record and character. The allegations against her have proved groundless in every case. Her opponents have distorted her record and twisted her statements into an unrecognizable caricature of the nominee. We are voting today on the real Dr. Elders, not the straw woman her opponents have attempted to portray.

This smokescreen of charges by her opponents has not fooled the people of Arkansas, and it will not fool the American people or the Members of the Senate. She is a superbly qualified physician who understands the real health problems of real people, especially children and the poor. She is a diamond in the rough—her opponents see the rough, but they always miss the diamond.

Because of her outstanding contributions to the health of the people of her State, Dr. Elders has been honored by the American Medical Association, the National Governors Association, the National Education Association, and many other organizations. She has received honorary degrees from seven universities—from Yale to the University of Minnesota to Lemoyne Christian College in Memphis, TN, to the Morehouse College of Medicine. She has been chosen by her peers—chief health officers throughout the country—to be the president of the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers. She has been endorsed by over 300 mainstream health, welfare, religious, and children's organizations—from the AMA to the YWCA, from the Methodist Church to the Junior League to the PTA.

Every allegation raised against Dr. Elders has been exhaustively examined and utterly refuted. Yet, as each allegation was disproved, her critics regrouped and came up with new attacks,

but the result has always been the same—the charge has fizzled.

In the last day of debate before the August recess, a new and particularly hurtful charge was made. Based on a single out-of-context and distorted quotation, Dr. Elders' opponents accused her of being anti-Catholic.

Dr. Elders is a woman of deep religious faith whose commitment to the church is well known. The scholarship that opened the doors of a college education to her came from the United Methodist Church. She has been an active and devoted member of the Hunter Methodist Church and has served on a number of church boards. Her brother is a minister. Indeed, she has been named lay person of the year by Methodist Church, and, among her many honors, one that gives her immense satisfaction is the invitation she received to address the global meeting of the United Methodist Church.

For someone who has herself suffered from prejudice and who is herself such a deeply religious person, the notion that she engages in religious bigotry is preposterous. Dr. Elders has the utmost respect for the Catholic Church and its members. She has emphasized her admiration for the many contributions that church-based programs and church-inspired citizens have made to education, health care, and social justice in America. She has specifically written to the National Conference of Catholic Bishops and apologized for any offense caused by her statements.

Dr. Elders is not anti-Catholic. She is not a radical. She is not outside the mainstream. She is not a divisive person. She is a healer and coalition builder who has worked with a wide variety of people of diverse viewpoints to bring better health care to the people of Arkansas and the Nation. Most of all, she is a preacher and a teacher of immense commitment and knowledge—exactly what we need in a Surgeon General, America's First Physician.

The heart of the opposition to Dr. Elders centers around two issues—her strong pro-choice position on the issue of abortion, and her equally strong commitment to addressing the crisis of teenage pregnancy in a realistic way.

Americans of good will clearly differ on the issue of abortion. But Dr. Elders' pro-choice views are the same as those of the President who appointed her—the President who was elected by the American people, and who deserves to have the pro-choice nominee of his choice confirmed.

With regard to teenage pregnancy, an effective Surgeon General committed to this issue can make impressive and long overdue progress. As we saw in our hearing and our debate on the Senate floor prior to the recess, it is not Dr. Elders who is outside the mainstream on this issue—it is her critics. Dr. Elders supports a policy of encouraging abstinence. But she also recognizes the

reality that not all teenagers will be abstinent. Dr. Elders' policy on this issue is precisely the policy of the top public health officials of the Reagan and Bush administrations, and it is a policy that has the broad support of the American people. Dr. Elders' opponents are entitled to their views, but they are not entitled to block Dr. Elders' nomination by distorting what she stands for.

We know the kind of difference that an effective Surgeon General can make to improve the health and lives of our fellow citizens. In the 1960's, Surgeon General Luther Terry roused the Nation to the dangers of smoking. In the 1980's, Surgeon General C. Everett Koop educated the Nation about the AIDS epidemic. In the 1990's, Dr. Joycelyn Elders has the potential to be a truly effective Surgeon General on all of the major public health challenges facing our country.

In the course of her distinguished career in public health, Dr. Elders has come to be widely respected, widely admired, and widely loved by the vast majority of those who know her, who have worked with her, or who know about her accomplishments and her deep commitment to better health care for all citizens. And when Dr. Elders says "all citizens," she means "all."

Her no-nonsense plain-speaking style has been especially frustrating to her ideological opponents. But it has made her admirers appreciate her all the more. Now, the Nation as a whole is about to feel the healing touch of this extraordinary woman. In the years to come it may well be said of Joycelyn Elders, as it was of Franklin Roosevelt, that she is loved for the enemies she has made.

I admire one other quality in Dr. Elders—her courage in facing up to her critics, and then facing them down. She has come through this unfair gauntlet of excessive criticism with flying colors. She has endured it, and she has prevailed over it. And her triumph here augurs well for her success in the years ahead as the Nation's Surgeon General. I urge the Senate to confirm her.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, I yield myself such time as I may use.

REPEAL OF THE RETROACTIVE PROVISIONS OF THE TAX BILL

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, I will just announce that shortly myself

and several of my colleagues will be introducing legislation to repeal the retroactive provisions of the tax bill that we passed just last month prior to adjournment. I mention that because I happen to have traveled around my State some during the month of August. I heard a lot of disgust from our constituents who were upset about the fact that we passed the tax increases retroactive back to January 1. Many of these constituents are individuals who will not have a tax increase, yet they still felt it was improper and not right, certainly not fair, to pass retroactive tax increases.

So I told them that I would be working to repeal the retroactive provisions and make the tax increases effective no earlier than the date of enactment of the tax bill. I expect that before the day is out, myself and several other people will be introducing that legislation.

THE NOMINATION OF DR. JOYCELYN ELDERS, OF ARKANSAS, TO BE SURGEON GENERAL OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The Senate continued with the consideration of the nomination.

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, during my trip through my State, I heard from a lot of my constituents concerning the nomination of Dr. Joycelyn Elders. I compliment my friend and colleague from Massachusetts, Senator KENNEDY, for a very eloquent statement. After listening to his statement, I am tempted to vote for confirmation, but I expect that I will not. The reason is not easy because Senator KENNEDY mentioned several things that were very complimentary to Dr. Elders, and I agree. She did come from a family of poverty. She did work hard and was able to educate herself. I compliment her on that.

Coming from an area that is very close to mine, Arkansas being the neighboring State of Oklahoma, to see somebody who comes from a large family, a poor family, and who is able to achieve a very esteemed stature as director of the Arkansas Health Department as well as becoming a doctor and so on I think is very laudable. I compliment her on her achievements.

But, Madam President, my reason for opposing Dr. Elders really is not through a desire, because I do not like opposing nominations. I do not do it very often. I have done it very seldom in my 13 years in the Senate. But I have decided to oppose Dr. Elders because of several statements that she has made that I think would disqualify her for this position. This is a very important position.

Senator KENNEDY said, well, it is the No. 1 doctor, the family doctor for the country. I agree with that. The Surgeon General has a great deal of pres-

tige. It is a bully pulpit, as many people have mentioned, for health care. If used properly, I think it could be a real asset to our country. We have been very fortunate in the country to have several outstanding Surgeons General who have advanced health causes and issues over the years.

My concern is that Dr. Elders has a very radical agenda. I say that not through any wish to malign her or to denigrate her position, but I am just reading statements that she has made—not 5 years ago, not 10 years ago. Some of these statements were made this year. Some were made last month that I believe should disqualify her for this position.

Senator KENNEDY alluded to the Catholic statements that I have mentioned before. I said I believe that those are bigoted statements. I will refer to that in a minute. But I think there are several statements, whether one is a Catholic or happens to be a Christian, if a person happens to be on the pro-life side of the issue, I think she has made very strong, intolerant statements that, to say the least, are troubling.

So I find that my recommendation, my vote, is going to be against confirmation of Joycelyn Elders for Surgeon General. Again, I do not take that lightly. I know my colleagues do not take it lightly when we will vote sometime later today or tomorrow.

Madam President, I think we should look at her words. On June 19 of this year, she appeared on the CNBC television program entitled "Talk Live." The caller asked her what she wanted to do or intended to do as Surgeon General about crack-addicted prostitutes that give birth to crack-addicted babies. Here is her response:

I would hope that we would provide them Norplant so they could still use sex if they must, to buy their drugs.

Madam President, is that the sort of statement that we would like to have from a Surgeon General? It so happens prostitution is illegal in most areas. It certainly is not healthy. Drug use is illegal in almost all States. Certainly use of crack is illegal, I believe, in every State. It is addictive. It can be deadly. Yet, her response was, I hope we would give them Norplant so, if they must continue to do so, they can still use sex if they must, so they can pay for their drugs.

That is a very irresponsible statement. That was made on a national television program. That was made in June. That is just a couple of months ago. Is that the type of statement that we want to have from somebody who has the authority, that has the prestige, that has the office of Surgeon General? I think not. Maybe I am wrong. Hopefully, that is a slip of the tongue. Frankly, during the confirmation hearing, she kind of expounded on it, but really did not take it back.

I find this to be the case on almost all the statements that she has made when given the chance or opportunity before Senator KENNEDY's committee. She would give a further explanation and maybe try to rationalize it, but, frankly, did not apologize, did not take it back, did not say, "Hey, I made a mistake." We all make mistakes. Frankly, I will not judge somebody just for the fact they made one or two statements that were a little harsh, a little irrational, maybe not fully developed, because I think most of us in this life have done that. But she continues to make a lot of statements that I find are intolerant, that are radical, that are clearly out of the mainstream, and that are quite offensive to millions of Americans; in some cases, hundreds of millions of Americans.

I just think of the many issues that are confronting us—and the Surgeon General will be dealing with issues that will affect every single family in America—one of the most controversial is abortion. I know I heard Dr. Elders before the committee say, "I am not about abortion; I am not. I don't like abortion. I want to prevent unwanted pregnancies. So abortion will not be an issue." And so abortion will not be an issue. But she testified before Congress in a written statement and said: "Abortion has had an important and positive public health effect."

That was not taken out of context. That was not a mistake. That was in a written statement and an oral statement she made before Congress on May 23, 1990.

I have been involved in the abortion debates before with proponents of the so-called pro-choice side, the pro-abortion rights side, and the pro-life side, but I have never heard anybody say it had a positive health effect, except for Dr. Elders. She said that before Congress. And she further explained that:

Abortion has reduced the number of children afflicted with severe defects. The number of Down's syndrome infants in Washington State in 1976 was 64 percent lower than it would have been without legal abortion.

Think of what that statement says. That statement basically says that if you have a fetus, an unborn child that is handicapped, we better abort it. This is going to reduce the number of children born with defects. Wow. That is a very serious statement. Again, that is a statement that was made before Congress. That is not a statement that was made to a pro-choice rally. That was a statement made before the U.S. Senate, the Labor and Human Resources Committee. "Abortion has had a positive public health impact." And she cites the fact that it has reduced the number of Down's syndrome infants. Wow. That is kind of startling for somebody who maybe has a child with Down's syndrome. I wonder what they would think about that statement. What about some other handicap, mental or physical?

(Mr. MATHEWS assumed the chair.)

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, Dr. Elders went on before that committee, and I will read to you a portion of a letter that came from the National Down's Syndrome Congress that she sent to Members of Congress. It said:

This raises some important questions in our minds as to her qualifications for the position of Surgeon General. It would appear from her testimony and written statements that her concern is more toward the cost of an individual's life as opposed to the value of the human life. It would not be a good choice to have the Surgeon General of the United States of America espousing such ideals.

That letter was written by the executive director of the National Down's Syndrome Congress sent to Members of Congress.

I happen to agree. I know many people in this Congress have been working with people with handicaps. I find it troubling that we would now have a Surgeon General—the No. 1 health officer in the country—that has made statements proclaiming the virtues and blessings of abortion because it might reduce the number of children born with Down's syndrome or maybe some other defect or problem. Mr. President, that is troubling.

During the confirmation hearing of Dr. Elders, she noted that she has two relatives with Down's syndrome, and she loves them, and she added that the decision to abort a child with Down's syndrome is a perfectly legitimate one. I might mention that she did not retreat from her earlier statement, which was not about individual choice but about the positive public health effect of abortion. One of the positive public health effects, she believes, is that we have fewer people with Down's syndrome.

I really find that statement unconscionable. She seemed to measure the success of a policy of abortion on demand, on the basis of the number of people with disabilities abortion has eliminated. I regret that the Senate appears to be prepared to confirm as Surgeon General someone who has taken such a radical and extreme position.

Dr. Elders did not stop there in singing the praises of abortion. She told the Labor Committee:

"Abortion was the single most important factor in the significant decrease in neonatal mortality between 1964 and 1977."

Think about the statement that abortion was the most important factor in a significant decrease in neonatal mortality between 1964 and 1977. The number of abortions went way up, and so the number of infants that were born and soon died went down. So if we destroy children in the mother's womb, fewer will die after they are born. That is logical. Is that to be complimented? Think of that statement. Wow. We have had more abortions, therefore we have fewer

problems with the children who are born.

Dr. Elders is nominated for the position of Surgeon General. We will probably confirm her for the position of Surgeon General, the No. 1 health officer in the country. Yet, she makes statements like that. Again, that is not a statement off the cuff. That was from her testimony before Congress in May of 1990, proclaiming the virtues and positive public health impacts and effects of abortion.

That is a startling statement. Again, I cannot think of other people who are even leaders in the so-called abortion rights area that have taken such an extreme position in talking about the positive public health impacts of abortion.

In other words, it is almost as if there is no life whatsoever in the woman, and if we destroy those that might have any problems before they are born, then we can save the time, expense and inconvenience of having a problem child or a problem person.

I wonder what that tells other people. Maybe we should extend that policy and say, "What about having a period of a month or two to find out what the baby is like; and if the baby has a real problem, then we will kill the baby, and we can save a lot of money then, too." And why do it just the first month, if you can do it up through the first 9 months of pregnancy? Wait a minute, we can do this for years. What about later on? We could have a Federal policy to determine if somebody has Alzheimer's and their value of life is maybe not worthwhile, so we will terminate that life, too.

How far would this philosophy go? I do not know. But it is scary. These statements talking about the positive public health effects of abortion were made by Dr. Elders in testimony before Congress just a couple years ago.

So not only does she have a radical or extreme position when it comes to abortion, but also she has a vehement dislike—a very strong dislike is too kind of a word, and I do not want to use the word hatred, but she has a very strong bias against people who happen to be on the so-called prolife side of the debate.

On January 19, 1992, before the Arkansas Democrat Gazette, she stated:

We would like for the right to life and antichoice groups to get over their love affair with the fetus and start supporting children.

Think of that statement.

We would like for the right-to-life and antichoice groups of people who are opposed to abortion to get over their love affair with the fetus and start supporting children.

I happen to know a lot of people who are involved in so-called right-to-life groups, the people who are opposed to abortion, and they are very supportive of children. So I am kind of offended by that statement.

And then "get over their love affair with the fetus." It almost shows a disdain or a very negative attitude toward the fetus.

The fetus happens to be an unborn child. I might mention we do not provide protection for unborn children. We do have laws on the books providing protection for unborn member of any number of endangered species. We have laws on the books that if you destroy an unborn animal, and I am thinking of the prairie mole cricket or spotted owl or whatever, there are fines and penalties up to \$50,000 and a year or more of imprisonment for destroying the life of many species, plant or animal, that might be categorized as endangered. But we do not do this for unborn human beings. And as a matter of fact, quite the opposite. Dr. Elders and others, including President Clinton and Mrs. Clinton, support having Federal funding to subsidize the destruction of unborn human beings.

But Dr. Elders goes further—not just talking about, well, we should have Federal funding of abortion, which she supports—but she goes further and basically shows real intolerance of people who happen to oppose her when she makes a statement that says the pro-life people should get over the love affair with a fetus. The fetus just happens to be an unborn child. And using that kind of language I think shows a great deal of intolerance toward people who happen to have a different viewpoint than Dr. Elders does on an issue such as abortion.

Mr. President, I might mention that Dr. Elders has stood by this quote. She tried to expand upon it. But frankly she has explained that she thinks of a love affair as a short-term commitment where when a child is born it is a lifetime commitment.

Frankly, again, I know many, many people who are engaged in the pro-life effort who are committed to life, unborn and born. And again that is a very offensive statement that she made. But she did not stop just ridiculing people who disagree with her. She went further and has referred to people who would oppose abortion as "non-Christians with slavemaster mentalities."

Think of that statement. This body is well divided and obviously so on the issue of abortion. The American people are divided on that issue. But to refer to people who oppose abortion or categorize them as non-Christians is offensive. And then to say non-Christians with slavemaster mentalities is doubly offensive. She has not retracted that statement. She did not say, "Hey." Think of that. How can you say that people who oppose abortion are non-Christians?

It just so happens most of the people I know who are involved in trying to protect the lives of unborn children are Christian but some also are Jews and some probably atheists who do not

think we should destroy unborn children. But she in a broad sweeping statement says they are non-Christians with slavemaster mentalities, implying that not only are they not Christians, they do not love their fellow man, but they also want people to raise kids in a slave-like environment. I just find that really offensive, really intolerant, and certainly not the kind of statement that one would expect from the Surgeon General.

The Washington Post on January 11 of this year attributed to her a comment characterizing pro-life Americans as "very religious non-Christians," again making a statement that happens to be before a pretty large newspaper. Characterizing pro-life people as "very religious non-Christians" is just a shocking statement. It is a bigoted statement toward anybody that happens to be pro-life or happens to be religious and happens to be pro-life.

How in the world can you paint a picture of people who happen to support protecting the lives of unborn children as "very religious non-Christians" is beyond me.

Again that is a statement not made 5 years ago. That is a statement made in January of this year. That was a statement I think made after it was known that President Clinton would probably in all likelihood nominate her as Surgeon General.

Mr. President, Senator KENNEDY alluded to the statement that I referred to about a month ago, when Dr. Elders was speaking at a pro-abortion rights rally in Little Rock in January 1992. Dr. Elders said,

For the first 400 years black people had freedom aborted and the church said nothing. The way of native Americans was aborted. The church was silent. During the Holocaust, the church was silent. And look who is fighting the pro-choice movement is a celibate male-dominated church.

Also, I believe I heard Senator KENNEDY say she apologized for these remarks, or maybe I did not but I read something that there was an apology.

Mr. President, there was no apology. At least in my opinion there was not an apology. I can tell you looking at some of the comments that were made by some of the groups that were offended. Here is a headline of an article that says "Catholics and Baptists Find Elders' Apology Lacking." The Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights joined an agency of Southern Baptists convention and two other religious pro-family groups denouncing as inadequate Dr. Joycelyn Elders' apologies to Catholics for any offense her remarks might have caused them.

Mr. President, this is a quote she made on the steps of the Capitol of Little Rock and has been one that has received a great deal of attention, one for which there have been meetings with priests and bishops and others trying to get Dr. Elders to apologize. I have copies of all the correspondence con-

cerning this issue, and I will just say I will read you Dr. Elders' response because Father James West brought this up and said, "Wait a minute. You made this statement. We would like an apology. You really made a very bigoted anti-Catholic remark." This happens to be in Southern Baptist Arkansas, like Oklahoma where there is a great deal of bigotry against the Catholic Church. And he requested an apology and did not get it.

He contacted Governor Clinton, requested an apology, and did not receive it. They had a meeting. And he still did not get an apology.

After several letters and exchanges, Dr. Elders writes on February 26 to Bishop McDonald, and in reading this statement:

As discussed, in my statement which was quoted in the media, I did not have any preconceived malice or intent to blaspheme the Roman Catholic church. I have the utmost respect for the Roman Catholic Church and its followers. If offense was taken at my use of the term "male-dominated" rather than "male-governed," please accept my sincere apology.

In other words, she did not retract one word, did not apologize for that statement, that paragraph, that really blasphemed the Catholic Church. They said the only things I really apologized for are I should have said "male-governed" instead of "male-dominated."

Again keep in mind this is after correspondence with the priest. It is after discussions with the priest and bishop, and after intervention by Governor Clinton. And the only apology she made is for saying it was "male-dominated" and she should have said "male-governed." That is what she apologized for.

That is no apology. That is no retraction. That is no statement.

And her recent apology said if any offense was taken I apologize for offending you, again not retracting the statement. This statement has offended millions of Americans, millions.

I entered into the RECORD last month several letters—I will just read one. Here is a letter from John Cardinal O'Connor, Archbishop of New York. He quotes the quote that I just mentioned and then he has another paragraph that says:

Catholics throughout American history have suffered from the effects of religious bigotry. It is a blot on our country's human rights record. Such blatant and broad sweeping attacks as have been attributed to Dr. Elders would be troubling on the lips of any citizen. To hear them from one appointed to a national pulpit is even more profoundly disturbing. This is particularly true considering that the stature of the Office of Surgeon General is great—particularly in recent years in the midst of a deepening national crisis over the effect of sexual irresponsibility.

Dr. Elders has also expressed contempt for the millions of Americans who participate in the human rights struggle for the unborn, and for the disabled. She purportedly scorns pro-life Americans as having a "love affair

with the fetus," and is quoted as saying that they "love little babies, as long as they're in someone else's uterus, rather than caring about children after they're born."

One traditionally associates the profession of medicine with special concern for the small and defenseless human being. Yet nowhere do I hear Dr. Elders acknowledge the slightest good will, the slightest compassion toward the child in the womb. Her alleged statements regarding unborn Down's syndrome children are most disquieting in this regard. She is also quoted as saying that "abortion has reduced the syndrome infants in Washington State in 1976 was 64 percent lower than it would have been without legal abortion." Apparently Dr. Elders regards the destruction of such children through abortion as part of the success story of modern medicine. As one who has spent many years of his life working with and for the retarded, I am deeply troubled by such an attitude.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the letter from John Cardinal O'Connor, Archbishop of New York.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 5, 1993.

DEAR SENATOR D'AMATO: I write to you as one deeply disturbed by remarks attributed to the nominee for Surgeon General, Dr. Joycelyn Elders, revealing substantial animosity toward the Catholic Church and Catholics generally. Dr. Elders is quoted as stating: "The first 400 years black people had their freedom aborted and the Church said nothing. The way of life for the Native American was aborted; the Church was silent. We attempted to eradicate a whole race of people through the Holocaust, and the Church was silent. *** Look at who's fighting the pro-choice movement; a celibate, male-dominated Church."

Catholics throughout American history have suffered from the effects of religious bigotry. It is a blot on our country's human rights record. Such blatant and broad sweeping attacks as have been attributed to Dr. Elders would be troubling on the lips of any citizen. To hear them from one appointed to a national pulpit is even more profoundly disturbing. This is particularly true considering that the stature of the Office of Surgeon General is great—particularly in recent years in the midst of a deepening national crisis over the effects of sexual irresponsibility.

Dr. Elders has also expressed contempt for the millions of Americans who participate in the human rights struggle for the unborn, and for the disabled. She purportedly scorns pro-life Americans as having a "love affair with the fetus," and is quoted as saying that they "love little babies, as long as they're in someone else's uterus, rather than caring about children after they're born."

One traditionally associates the profession of medicine with special concern for the small and defenseless human being. Yet nowhere do I hear Dr. Elders acknowledge the slightest good will, the slightest compassion toward the child in the womb. Her alleged statements regarding unborn Down's Syndrome children are most disquieting in this regard. She is also quoted as saying that "abortion has reduced the Syndrome infants in Washington State in 1976 was 64% lower than it would have been without legal abortion." Apparently Dr. Elders regards the destruction of such children through abortion as part of the success story of modern medicine. As one who has spent many years of his

life working with and for the retarded, I am deeply troubled by such an attitude.

Dr. Elders seems also to have clearly expressed an intent not only to continue, but to intensify the utterly failed policy of offering contraception freely to teenagers. Twenty years of this practice has failed to improve our children's health and well-being. In fact, they are associated with substantial declines in the quality of their lives, with increases in teenage sexual activity, teen abortions, sexually transmitted diseases, and out-of-wedlock pregnancies. Yet nowhere do I see Dr. Elders required to assume the burden of proof as to why 20 years of failed social policy should be followed by 4 more.

Thank you for your vote on August 3 on the Nickles Amendment to the Treasury/Postal Appropriations Bill. It was a tragedy that the substance of Senator Nickles' proposal did not receive the full deliberation it deserved, but I thank you for your part in seeking to obtain Senate consideration. In future votes on the Hyde Amendment and National Health Care, I hope that you will reflect on the conscience problems inherent in requiring any taxpayer, any employer, any employee, to contribute any amount, no matter how small, to an act they acknowledge to be nothing less than the deliberate destruction of innocent human life.

I do hope you will consider the points I have raised. Considering the crisis of values our nation is now facing, I do not believe that concerns about religious intolerance and moral responsibility are trivial. I look forward to your reply.

Faithfully in Christ,

JOHN CARDINAL O'CONNOR,
Archbishop of New York.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, also on September 1, Father James West, who originally approached this issue of anti-Catholic sentiments by Dr. Elders, and who, as a result of her statement, had written a letter to the Washington Post. He is from Bigelow, AR, from the St. Boniface Catholic Church.

In this letter, he says:

I would like to present some information which, from the standpoint of the Catholic Church and of all persons of religious conviction, is crucial to the debate on the nomination of Dr. Joycelyn Elders for Surgeon General of the United States.

I write this letter as the priest who directly confronted Dr. Joycelyn Elders in Arkansas for her blatantly anti-Catholic remarks made in our State Capitol Building on January 18, 1992. This face-to-face meeting between Dr. Elders and myself occurred on February 28, 1992 as the result of my personal campaign to obtain an apology from Dr. Elders on behalf of the Catholics of the state of Arkansas. Then-Governor Bill Clinton, perhaps recognizing some potential political damage to himself from this affair, had instructed Dr. Elders to arrange this meeting with me.

As the result of a trip I made to Washington, D.C. in July to bring this to national attention, it is now commonly known that Dr. Elders has accused the Roman Catholic Church of "silence" during various occasions of past injustice, including the Nazi Holocaust. Dr. Elders has also referred to the Catholic Church as "a celebrate, male-dominated church," as she identified those she holds to be her enemies.

Dr. Elders would now have all believe that she sincerely apologized to the Roman Catholic Church as a result of my meeting with her. One would think, then, that all

things are now in order between Dr. Elders and the Catholic Church. However, this is far from the truth.

A couple of points must be made here. First, Dr. Elders' "apology" was no apology at all. She has stated only that she is sorry "if offense was taken" to her statement. She has never apologized for having made the statement. Secondly, at my meeting with Dr. Elders, I only challenged her on her designation of us as "a celibate, male-dominated church," an obviously insulting denigration of what we hold to be the very sacred structure of our Church. Surprisingly enough, Dr. Elders at first refused to acknowledge that she had referred to the Catholic Church at all. When she could no longer defend that position, she then refused to acknowledge that she had meant to offend Catholics by her statement! I brought her to an admission on both counts. Even then, though, I was only able to obtain an "apology" for any "offense taken" to her use of the term "male-dominated" rather than "male-governed." Never has Dr. Elders offered the slightest apology for having held the Catholic Church up as the target of her wrath. ***

I will skip a couple of paragraphs and just read one or two more.

It is now nearly 20 months following Dr. Elders' clear statement of anti-Catholic bigotry. If Dr. Elders is now prepared to issue a blanket apology for having made her offensive remarks—not just for any "offense taken" to her remarks—the value and sincerity of that apology must be called into question. Dr. Elders has steadfastly refused to the present day to issue such an apology. ***

That is signed by Father James West, Pastor of St. Boniface Church.

I will just mention this, as well. I have a letter from the Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights in opposition, and also stating that they are dissatisfied with the so-called apology. I will just read this last paragraph.

For Dr. Elders to now issue an apology is as expedient as it is unpersuasive. To be sure, anyone can make a remark in the heat of discussion that is later regretted, but when a series of untoward comments are made about a group of persons—such as the remarks that Dr. Elders has made about Catholics and the Catholic Church—it cannot be dismissed as merely a mistake.

It is for these reasons that we have come together today to voice our concerns over the record of Dr. Joycelyn Elders and to ask for the most careful deliberations when the Senate reconvenes.

That is signed by William Donohue, President of the Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights. It is a two-page statement in opposition to Dr. Elders.

Also signing onto this statement is Patrick Riley, Washington director of the Catholic League. Also signing this is James Smith, director of government relations, Southern Baptist Convention.

And I have a letter from James Smith with the Christian Life Commission of the Southern Baptist Convention in opposition to Dr. Elders. I will just read the last two paragraphs.

In fact, one news account (The Washington Times, February 1, 1993, Page A1) reports

that Dr. Elders was forced to apologize to some members of the Arkansas General Assembly for characterizing them as "very religious non-Christians." According to Carol Roddy, Dr. Elders' spokeswoman, Elders "sent carefully crafted apologies."

Now she has "apologized" to Catholics.

Dr. Elders has not been a responsible public official in Arkansas and cannot be trusted to be so in Washington. I believe she is incapable of serving all Americans, including millions of evangelicals, Catholics, and other religious Americans whose views differ from her own—especially those Americans who are pro-life.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Father West, the news release from the Catholic League, as well the letter from the Christian Life Commission be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. BONIFACE CHURCH,
Bigelow, AR, September 1, 1993.

Letters to the Editor,
The Washington Post, Washington, DC.

TO THE EDITOR: This letter is sent in regard to the article by Al Kamen of September 1, 1993, "Elders and Bishops Exchange Words." I would like to present some information which, from the standpoint of the Catholic Church and of all persons of religious conviction, is crucial to the debate on the nomination of Dr. Joycelyn Elders for Surgeon General of the United States.

I write this letter as the priest who directly confronted Dr. Joycelyn Elders in Arkansas for her blatantly anti-Catholic remarks made in our State Capitol Building on January 18, 1992. This face-to-face meeting between Dr. Elders and myself occurred on February 28, 1992 as the result of my personal campaign to obtain an apology from Dr. Elders on behalf of the Catholics of the state of Arkansas. Then-Governor Bill Clinton, perhaps recognizing some potential political damage to himself from this affair, had instructed Dr. Elders to arrange this meeting with me.

As the result of a trip I made to Washington, DC in July to bring this to national attention, it is now commonly known that Dr. Elders has accused the Roman Catholic Church of "silence" during various occasions of past injustice, including the Nazi Holocaust. Dr. Elders has also referred to the Catholic Church as "a celibate, male-dominated church," as she identified those she holds to be her enemies.

Dr. Elders would now have all believe that she sincerely apologized to the Roman Catholic Church as a result of my meeting with her. One would think, then, that all things are now in order between Dr. Elders and the Catholic Church. However, this is far from the truth.

A couple of points must be made here. First, Dr. Elders' "apology" was no apology at all. She has stated only that she is sorry "if offense was taken" to her statement. She has never apologized for having made the statement. Secondly, at my meeting with Dr. Elders, I only challenged her on her designation of us as "a celibate, male-dominated church," an obviously insulting denigration of what we hold to be the very sacred structure of our Church. Surprisingly enough, Dr. Elders at first refused to acknowledge that she had referred to the Catholic Church at all. When she could no longer defend that position, she then refused

to acknowledge that she had meant to offend Catholics by her statement. I brought her to an admission on both counts. Even then, though, I was only able to obtain an "apology" for any "offense taken" to her use of the term "male-dominated" rather than "male-governed." Never has Dr. Elders offered the slightest apology for having held the Catholic Church up as the target of her wrath.

I stress again, though, that I only confronted Dr. Elders on her reference to us as "a celibate, male-dominated church." At the time of our meeting, I was unaware of the full text of her anti-Catholic remarks. Only the night before leaving for Washington, a year and a half later, was I able to view a video tape of her entire speech. I included the full text of her anti-Catholic remarks in my opposition to her nomination. However, the "apology" made by Dr. Elders in no way was intended to repair any damage she had caused by her accusations of "silence" against the Catholic Church in the past. That, simply, was not a part of our discussion for the reason I have already given.

For Dr. Elders now to make any claim to have "apologized" to the Catholic Church for her offensive remarks is, therefore, untrue on two counts: 1) Her "apology" was no real apology at all, and 2) Her "apology" in no way addressed her bigoted accusations of "silence" on the part of the Catholic Church. Until now, she simply has never been challenged on the full text of her statement. Any claim of hers to the contrary is nothing more than a deliberate distortion of the truth.

It is now nearly 20 months following Dr. Elders' clear statement of anti-Catholic bigotry. If Dr. Elders is now prepared to issue a blanket apology for having made her offensive remarks—not just for any "offense taken" to her remarks—the value and sincerity of that apology must be called into question. Dr. Elders has steadfastly refused to the present day to issue such an apology.

Civilized society places great value on any apology given by conviction. However, no apology of convenience or political expedience could ever hold as much weight or bring a restoration of respect to the one who apologizes.

Sincerely in Christ,

FR. JAMES P. WEST,

Pastor.

CATHOLIC LEAGUE FOR
RELIGIOUS AND CIVIL RIGHTS,
New York, NY, September 2, 1993.

JOINT STATEMENT ON THE NOMINATION OF DR.
ELDERS

National Press Club, Washington, DC.

The nomination of Dr. Joycelyn Elders to be Surgeon General is not something that any of us can take lightly. While some of us are primarily disturbed by the substance of her positions, and others are primarily disturbed by the tone of her remarks, all of us agree that Dr. Elders has a record that is profoundly troubling. We feel confident that if the American people knew as much about Dr. Elders as we do that they would surely share our convictions.

Dr. Elders believes that the best way to combat teenage pregnancies is to freely distribute condoms to public school students. But the evidence is not supportive of this approach. Under her tenure as director of the Arkansas Health Department, the teen pregnancy rate rose by 12 percent in the 11 Arkansas counties that had school-based clinics. What is most striking about this figure, however, is that it was a complete turn-

around: in the period prior to Dr. Elders' tenure, the teen pregnancy rates had actually declined. Indeed, one of the reasons why the condom-giving approach failed in Arkansas was that a large portion of the condoms were defective. Dr. Elders knew this to be true yet inexplicably continued the distribution program.

Now consider, for a moment, what would happen if a candidate for a position in the Department of Defense knew that the missile system that he had trumpeted had already proven to be a failure, and that, worse still, many of the missiles had in fact been shown to be defective. Is there any wonder what would happen to his nomination?

Just as troublesome is the cavalier attitude that Dr. Elders exhibits towards condoms: "I tell every girl that when she goes out on a date, put a condom in her purse." Now that may pass as responsible in some quarters, but most parents, we believe, would agree with us that it is the wrong message to send to adolescents, many of whom are struggling to practice a degree of restraint.

Even more objectionable, however, is the following comment, made by Dr. Elders on April 2, 1993: "We have had driver's ed for our kids. We've taught them what to do in the front seat of the car, but not what to do in the back seat of the car." It would be instructive to know who should be teaching what technique to these youngsters. The much reputed "condom plant" that Dr. Elders proudly displays in her office suggests that whatever method is taught, no lesson will be complete without a "how-to" session on the proper application of condoms.

STATEMENT OF JAMES A. SMITH, DIRECTOR OF
GOVERNMENT RELATIONS, SOUTHERN BAPTIST
CONVENTION, CHRISTIAN LIFE COMMISSION

I am pleased to join my Catholic and evangelical friends today in calling on the United States Senate to reject the nomination of Dr. Joycelyn Elders as surgeon general of the United States.

Much has been made recently over Dr. Elders' comments which have so unmercifully attacked Catholics. While Dr. Elders has offered what seems to be to be a half-hearted apology to Baltimore Archbishop William H. Keeler, no such apology has been offered to evangelicals and other Christians who also have been the target of her vicious attacks. Southern Baptists and other evangelicals in Arkansas have shared with me the disdain they have felt from Dr. Elders because of their opposition to her public policy agenda.

I am deeply disturbed that Dr. Elders has demonstrated a pattern of attributing the worst possible motives to individuals and organizations who have consistently opposed her public policies on the basis of their faith. While it may be too harsh to assign religious bigotry as a motive, Dr. Elders has clearly exhibited a pattern of behavior in which she vilifies those whose public policy positions are different from her own.

In fact, one news account (The Washington Times, February 1, 1993, Page A1) reports that Dr. Elders was forced to apologize to some members of the Arkansas General Assembly for characterizing them as "very religious non-Christians." According to Carol Roddy, Dr. Elders' spokeswoman, Elders "sent carefully crafted apologies."

Now she has "apologized" to Catholics. Dr. Elders has not been a responsible public official in Arkansas and cannot be trusted to be so in Washington. I believe she is incapable of serving all Americans, including millions of evangelicals, Catholics and other

religious Americans whose views differ from her own—especially those Americans who are pro-life.

(The Christian Life Commission is the public policy agency of the Southern Baptist Convention, which is the country's largest Protestant denomination with 15.4 million members in more than 38,400 congregations.)

On a more serious note, we are alarmed by the way Dr. Elders approaches the delicate subject of abortion. When Dr. Elders boasts that "abortion was the single most important factor in the significant decrease in neonatal mortality between 1964 and 1977," and when she exclaims that "abortion has reduced the number of children afflicted with severe defects," she makes a case that the proponents of infanticide would be glad to endorse. In this context it must be said that our society has come a long way from the days when people like Jesse Jackson warned that abortion was a form of genocide against black people to the present endorsement of abortion as a form of population control. It is sad that it even needs to be said, but killing innocent human beings is no way to resolve health problems.

As if all this weren't enough to give us pause, the tone of Dr. Elders' remarks, especially as they apply to persons who for religious reasons disagree with her, is sufficient to warrant grave concern. It is highly offensive to label those who oppose abortion as "non-Christians with slave-master mentalities." It is factually wrong and morally wrong to say that pro-life persons "love little babies so long as they are in someone else's uterus." And it is downright insulting to maintain that those who oppose abortion have "a love affair with the fetus." No, Dr. Elders, those of us who are pro-life are concerned about life issues from the time of conception to the time of death. You have every right to disagree with that position, but not to belittle us while doing so.

And to top it off, Dr. Elders has made a series of remarks that have upset millions of Catholics. To blame the Catholic Church, for instance, for remaining "silent" and doing "nothing" about everything from slavery to the Holocaust is a characterization that is not only patently false, it is malicious in effect, if not in intent. For Dr. Elders to now issue an apology is as expedient as it is unpersuasive. To be sure, anyone can make a remark in the heat of discussion that is later regretted, but when a series of untoward comments are made about a group of persons—such as the remarks that Dr. Elders has made about Catholics and the Catholic Church—it cannot be dismissed as merely a mistake.

It is for these reasons that we have come together today to voice our concerns over the record of Dr. Joycelyn Elders and to ask for the most careful deliberations when the Senate reconvenes.

Statement prepared by: William A. Donohue, Ph.D., President, Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights.

Statement delivered by: Patrick Riley, Ph.D., Washington Director, Catholic League.

Co-Signing Organizations: James A. Smith, Director of Government Relations, Southern Baptist Convention, Christian Life Commission, Catholic War Veterans, American Family Association, Eagle Forum.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, these are not radical, right-wing religious zealots that are opposing this nomination. These are very large religious organizations. The Southern Baptist Convention happens to be the largest denomination in my State. My guess is

that it is probably the largest in Arkansas. I think that, nationwide, Catholics number something like 60 million.

And Dr. Elders' comments and statements have been registered. They have not been retracted. She has not apologized for making the statements. She did not say they were in error.

They are bigoted statements. They are intolerant statements. They are not the kind of statements that we would expect from the Surgeon General of the United States. They are divisive statements. They are not healing statements.

Mr. President, I have a letter from two members of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission addressed to the President of the United States, August 4, 1993.

We respectfully ask you to withdraw the nomination of Dr. Joycelyn Elders to be Surgeon General and Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services for health policy. Dr. Elders has made a series of public statements demonstrating religious bigotry against Catholics and other Christians. As members of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, we believe that these statements disqualify her from serving in a national position of public trust.

Mr. President, it is a two page letter, signed by Carl A. Anderson, Commissioner, and also Robert P. George, Commissioner. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD, as well.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 4, 1993.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We respectfully ask you to withdraw the nomination of Dr. Joycelyn Elders to be Surgeon General and Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services for health policy. Dr. Elders has made a series of public statements demonstrating religious bigotry against Catholics and other Christians. As members of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, we believe that these statements disqualify her from serving in a national position of public trust.

As one example or her hostile remarks, in an address last year at the State Capitol in Little Rock she was recorded as saying: " * * * the first 400 years black people had their freedom aborted, and the Church said nothing. The way of life for the Native American was aborted; the church was silent. We attempted to eradicate a whole race of people through the Holocaust, and the Church was silent * * * Look who's fighting the pro-choice movement: a celibate, male-dominated Church * * * ."

Dr. Elders speaks contemptuously of Christians who disagree with her. Some she accuses of having "a Bible-belt mentality," while others are "very religious non-Christians" with "slave-master mentalities." She neither denies making these irresponsible remarks nor, despite vague promises, has she ever publicly apologized for doing so.

The Washington Post editors have written that the Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights was correct when it said that Dr. Elders remarks "smacked of ignorance or malice and that it was a rank distortion of history to say that the Catholic Church was

"silent" or did "nothing" about past instances of societal injustice." The Post added that her "approach to public discourse is troubling." The truth is, it is more than troubling. It is disqualifying.

The United States Commission on Civil Rights has repeatedly denounced religious bigotry. The Commission has pointed out that the divisive political and spiritual effects of such bias threaten the very foundations of our democracy. For instance, in an October 23, 1991 letter to President Bush and the Members of Congress, the Commission wrote: "Confronted with religious bigotry, the need for strong moral leadership is clear. * * * [T]he Commission calls on elected officials to take all action within their power to eliminate religious discrimination and bigotry."

Speaking as individual members, we believe that the nomination of someone guilty of making religiously insensitive and intolerant remarks sets back the cause of mutual respect and good will among Americans of all religious beliefs.

Recently, Senator Carol Moseley-Braun gave a powerful and moving speech in the U.S. Senate in which she convinced a large majority of Senators not to renew the design patent of the United Daughters of the Confederacy. As Senator Moseley-Braun said with great righteousness: "It is an outrage. It is an insult. It is absolutely unacceptable to me and to millions of Americans, black or white, that we would put the imprimatur of the United States Senate on a symbol of this kind of idea." She said, Mr. President, that your election signalled "a change that said we have to get past * * * the many issues that divide us as Americans, and come together as Americans so we can make this country be what it can be in the 21st century."

We believe the millions of American Catholics and other Christian faithful feel the same indignation concerning the holding of federal office by a person with a history of anti-religious prejudice.

We are certain that there are a large number of medical practitioners, women and men of all ethnic and racial backgrounds who are both well qualified for this position and untainted by intolerance. Mr. President, your administration should not be tarnished with the appearance of condoning hate speech and bigotry. We therefore respectfully ask you to withdraw Dr. Elders name.

Very Sincerely yours,

CARL A. ANDERSON,
Commissioner.

ROBERT P. GEORGE,
Commissioner.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I have cited several of Dr. Elders' quotes. Let me assure you, I have not even touched on many. Let me assure you these are not quotes that are taken out of context; these are not quotes that are being misused. These are quotes by Dr. Elders that have been made repeatedly. I saw a video of one of these statements. I will just say that I lack the eloquence and the passion and delivery of Dr. Elders. She made these statements that, if you saw them on videotape, were made very persuasively, maybe, from her side; but they were also very inflammatory and very offensive to any who would characterize themselves or classify themselves as Christians or as Catholics or as persons who happened to be opposed to abortion.

Although my opposition to Dr. Elders probably originated because of some of the statements she has made, it also goes further than that because I have also had a chance, now, to examine her record and I am going to discuss that.

I see a couple of colleagues who wish to speak. I do not want to monopolize the floor. I can bring these issues up later.

But looking at several things that were done while Dr. Elders was director of the Arkansas Department of Public Health, I think some actions that were taken should also disqualify her as Surgeon General. And I will bring these up in a moment. But I do see a couple of my colleagues, one of whom has been waiting patiently for about 30 minutes.

So, Mr. President, I will continue later, and at this time I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

MS. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, I rise this morning, now for the fifth time, to urge my colleagues to support the nomination of Dr. Joycelyn Elders for the position of Surgeon General.

Before the recess, many of my colleagues and I spoke on the floor in support of this nomination.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator will withhold—

MR. KENNEDY. I yield such time as the Senator may require.

MS. MOSELEY-BRAUN. My thanks to the Senator from Massachusetts.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

MS. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, this is the fourth time, perhaps the fifth time I am speaking on behalf of Joycelyn Elders. It is interesting. As I was sitting here, listening to some of the debate earlier—in fact, I had my speech from before the recess sitting right here, as I had occasion to go over what it was I said then and how I would change it to speak in favor of her nomination today—it occurred to me that really nothing has changed since before the recess with regard to this nomination.

You will recall, perhaps, that there was debate at that time and that the reason for the delay of this nomination—for asking that it be held over—was to allow the period of the recess to give rise to a generation of new controversy about this nomination. I am very pleased to report that no such new controversy has arisen; that in fact we are in pretty much the same position we were before the recess and that nothing really has changed. Dr. Elders remains the qualified, competent, capable nominee that she was before we went into recess and now, with the passage of almost a month, we are confronted once again with voting on her nomination. I hope this time it will be speedy and we can confirm this nominee and let her get beyond the misery of what this confirmation process must have been on a personal level.

Dr. Elders has undergone the appropriate review and examination required of any nominee. She was examined closely at her committee hearing on July 23, and responded to a wide variety of inquiries, ranging from her views on adolescent health to the specifics of her care for her mother-in-law.

In addition, she has responded to over 230 written questions in detail. The information that was discussed at the hearing, and each and every one of those 230-plus—I daresay—questions are now available for review by any Member of this body, as are the FBI reports on Dr. Elders.

So all of that information, the wealth of information that has been generated about this nominee, again continues to underscore and confirm the fact that we have here a qualified, competent, capable nominee to be Surgeon General of the United States.

The attempts to derail Dr. Elders' nomination have, for that reason, and for that reason alone, Mr. President, failed. Those who have sought to disparage Dr. Elders' accomplishments have been unsuccessful. And while, on the one hand, our scrutiny of Presidential nominees is always intrusive and sometimes painful, the pain in this case has been aggravated by what can only be described as character assassination.

Dr. Elders, however, has risen above the character assassination. She has not had to respond to it in kind. In fact, it has fallen of its own weight. I am delighted by the calm and dispassionate consideration and discussion of her nomination today, in contrast to some of those previous four times that I spoke in her behalf, when the testimony and debate was much more passionate and the assaults were much more malicious.

So I welcome the calm, dispassionate atmosphere in which the nomination is being taken up under this time agreement, and as we proceed to consideration of her nomination and actually vote on her nomination.

But I was reminded, in listening to some of the debate and discussion about Dr. Elders' nomination, of a comment that Senator BYRD made while I was presiding, about an hour ago now, as he discussed the history of Rome. I do not know how many people who are in the Chamber now had an opportunity to hear Senator BYRD. I certainly always enjoy listening to him. He is a consummate storyteller and, of course, the history of Rome is something that I think we can all study and learn from.

But one of the things that he said in the course of his discussion was that the decline or the end of the Republic was characterized by what he called a sophisticated cynicism—I hope I have the words right—a sophisticated cynicism among the senate and the people who were in power at the time, and

how that began to undermine the actual fiber of the nation at the time.

I must say, I was struck by the correlation with the Elders nomination and the sophisticated cynicism that Senator BYRD talked about; the notion that somehow or another we have no room in our Government, we have no place in these circles of power, for people who speak the truth, who tell it like it is, who say what is on their minds and who speak plainly.

I submit to you that Dr. Elders has always spoken the truth; has told it as she saw it; spoken her mind; spoken truthfully and honestly to the issues and concerns of the American people with regard to their public health. She has talked about her concern for children, sometimes in controversial contexts. But she has talked about her concern for children with a consistent truth that rings so loud that it is incapable to any person who has reviewed her work and followed her discussion of the issues over time.

One of the previous commentators spoke about her comment about giving Norplant to drug-addicted prostitutes. What better statement of concern for children than to suggest that drug-addicted prostitutes should not become pregnant and therefore should be given a contraceptive before the fact? It is that kind of concern that is consistent, even though it comes out sometimes in controversial ways.

Dr. Elders is a nominee who has always championed concerns of children—children's health—and advocated preventive health care and early, aggressive intervention. That has been a hallmark of her career. It is in that that she has been consistent across the board.

To talk a little about her background, she has, during her tenure as director of health for the State of Arkansas, almost doubled the number of pregnant women and children receiving food assistance. I daresay the statistics from her tenure as the director of public health in Arkansas indicated that the rate of abortions declined during her tenure.

She was a director who was instrumental in luring a significant number of physicians to rural community health centers so those areas would not be underserved. As director, she improved and expanded prenatal care, early childhood screening, and HIV and cancer prevention programs for the State of Arkansas. Prior to serving as State Health Director, she established a successful clinical practice and research career in pediatric endocrinology at the University of Arkansas.

It seems to me, Mr. President, Dr. Elders has passed the test. She has passed the credentials test. There is no one here who would argue that this woman is not well qualified for the position to which the President has nominated her. She has passed the competence

test. Her record in Arkansas, her record in public life, her record as an administrator, as a public health advocate is clear and compelling. In fact, if anything, she has received accolades across the board for her performance in office.

She has passed the character test, those 230-plus questions that she answered. The FBI investigation went into every dot and tittle of her background, every issue, every question that could possibly be answered. I daresay, Mr. President, that there are not 200 Americans in this entire country who would want to subject themselves to the kind of scrutiny that Dr. Elders has not only been subjected to, but that she has come through with flying colors.

So I guess the question today is whether or not we are going to have a brandnew test, whether or not we are going to raise the barrier, raise the bar to another level altogether and come up with a new test, the quotation test, if you will; that we are now going to judge nominees not only based on their credentials and their competence and their character, but we are now going to base them on whether or not their quotations fit with our view of what people should and should not say.

I daresay Senator BYRD hit the nail on the head when he talked about a sophisticated cynicism that says you can only talk about issues in a way that sounds good, that does not ruffle feathers, that does not displease people, does not put people off because, if you do, you stand in grave danger of having someone stand on the floor of the Senate and question your commitment because of the way that you make your statements.

I want to talk about this issue, Mr. President, in the context of what the Surgeon General's job is and what that job is about and what the concerns and what the issues are that Dr. Elders will be called upon to face because, quite frankly, as we talk about a quotations test, as we begin to take this down to whether or not someone said good morning properly or whether or not one person was offended by the way she told the truth about an issue or not, to talk about what it is that we are talking about and what is at stake here because I think that somehow or another in our focusing in on how many angels or devils, if you will, there are on the top of that particular pinhead, we may have missed the picture of what it is that is involved with the office of Surgeon General and what it is that Dr. Elders is called to service to address.

Today, every 35 seconds in America an infant is born into poverty. Every 2 minutes an infant is born with a low birth weight. Every 14 minutes an infant dies in the first year of life, and this is in the most advanced Nation in the world. Every 21 seconds, a 15- to 19-

year-old woman becomes sexually active for the first time. Every 32 seconds, a 15- to 19-year-old woman becomes pregnant. Every 64 seconds, an infant is born to a teenage mother, and that in this, the most advanced country in the world. Every 14 hours, a child younger than 5 years old is murdered. Every 5 hours, a 15- to 19-year-old child is murdered.

So we have statistics that point to a status of health care that is really at this point in our history worse than it was 20 years ago. I would like to, in that regard—I am quoting actually from some things that Dr. Elders herself has referred to in her writing, the Code Blue Report of the National Commission on the Role of the School.

In 1965, there were roughly four cases of gonorrhea and syphilis for every 1,000 American adolescents. In 1985, there were 12. CDC, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, estimates that 2.5 million adolescents each year contract a sexually transmitted disease, and that does not include fully the statistics associated with the onslaught of HIV and AIDS.

In 1965, 16.7 out of every 1,000 unmarried teenage girls age 15 to 19 gave birth during that year. In 1985, 31.6 out of every 1,000 did. So we have seen in that 20-year period a dramatic increase in teen pregnancies.

In 1950, the rate of youths age 14 to 17 who were arrested during that year was 4 for every 1,000. In 1985, the rate was 118 per 1,000.

In the 1950's, less than 5 percent of youth experimented with an illicit drug before entering the 10th grade. In 1987, over 30 percent of youth had done so.

In 1965, 9.8 percent of all children under 18 years old lived in a single-parent home. In 1985, 21 percent lived in a single-parent home.

In 1960, 39 percent of mothers with school-age children were working outside of the home. In 1987, fully 70 percent—70 percent—of mothers of school-age children were working outside the home.

These are the kinds of statistics, these are the kind of issues that the Surgeon General is called upon to address, and we stand here talking about a quotation made on a TV show, a late night response? It boggles the mind, Mr. President, that we somehow may have lost sight of what it is that we are here to do, why this nomination is so important, and the significance to millions of Americans of this nomination being confirmed and confirmed soon because time really is being wasted.

I had occasion, Mr. President, to go home during the recess as well, and I went around my State with a series of townhall meetings to meet with constituents, to meet with people throughout Illinois to talk about their views. Our State has been stricken and afflicted with great flood damage. In

fact, the flood has been called the greatest in this century. So I had occasion to go around and visit flood-damaged areas and talk with people who are trying now to recuperate from the flood, and I talked to people throughout Illinois, in both the cities and the suburbs and the rural areas.

I, too, had occasion to talk with people about what their concerns were. I daresay that the concerns that were expressed to me during that visit home related more or supported more the urgency of confirming this nomination than anything else.

The people, particularly those who were in flood-ravaged areas, talked about public health concerns, talked about cleanup, talked about whether or not there would be adequate programs to help families get back together, families, in many instances, where the wage earners had lost their jobs because the employment did not exist anymore, the kind of stress they were under, what would be available to help in the communities.

Then as I went to the suburban areas, people were concerned about whether or not the AIDS virus was really taking over an entire generation. I had occasion—it was really devastating to me, Mr. President—to meet a 25-year-old woman, college student, bright, energetic, a sweet girl, who had discovered that she was afflicted with AIDS, HIV, and was facing death.

I daresay these kinds of concerns transcend whether or not somebody said something right to a TV commentator. Every day some 135,000 American students bring guns to school, and every day 30 children are wounded and 10 children die from guns. As I went through the cities, I saw people concerned about whether or not their youngsters could even get to school because of the threat of guns and whether or not the violence in the community was such that their children had no safe route to get from home to school and back again without taking their lives in their hands.

This is the kind of epidemic, this is the kind of situation that we face in America today, and these are the kinds of challenges that the Surgeon General of the United States is called upon to address.

The homicide rate has doubled among 10- to 14-year-olds during the past 20 years, and it is now the leading cause of death among black 15- to 19-year-old men.

Over the past 20 years, the suicide rate has tripled among 10- to 14-year-olds and doubled among 15- to 19-year-olds. Abuse and neglect of children has increased 74 percent during the past decade, and every year more than 2 million children and adolescents are reported to be abused and neglected. I will not go on with these statistics, although I would, however, like to have this statement printed in the RECORD: "Children, Poverty and Health."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

CHILDREN, POVERTY, AND HEALTH

Today we live in a "throw away" society. How many of you actively recycle newspapers, glass bottles, aluminum cans, white office paper? I bet none of you were doing so five years ago. The Green Earth movement has done an excellent job educating us about solid waste land-fills that are rapidly filling up with nonbiodegradable, disposable diapers and the threat of the hole in the ozone. If you ask any eighth grader today what they are worried about, they will tell you, "the environment." Manufacturers are picking up on this and re-thinking elaborate packaging of everyday products.

Somehow, we have gotten the impression of our disposable, throw-away society that our most valuable resource is disposable too! I hope when we leave here today, you will join me in my crusade to save our children. It is our only hope for the future. Consider with me the following:

MOMENTS IN AMERICA

Every 35 seconds an infant is born into poverty.

Every 2 minutes an infant is born at low birthweight.

Every 11 minutes an infant is born at very low birthweight.

Every 14 minutes an infant dies in the first year of life.

Every 21 seconds a 15 to 19 year old woman becomes sexually active for the first time.

Every 32 seconds a 15 to 19 year old woman becomes pregnant.

Every 64 seconds an infant is born to a teenage mother.

Every 14 hours a child younger than 5 is murdered.

Every 5 hours a 15 to 19 year old is murdered. (4)

For most of our history, American parents have delighted in seeing their children achieve more than they did themselves. Each generation has been better educated, better housed, more skilled, and more economically secure than the previous one. But for many Americans, those days are over. For perhaps the first time since the Great Depression, American children will no longer routinely surpass their parents' standard of living. (3)

America is the world's wealthiest nation. But today, our poorest Americans are the 12 million children who live in poverty. They are the members of what I call the 5-H Club—the hungry, the homeless, the helpless, the hugless, and the hopeless.

The children, who are our only hope for the future, are hanging by a very slender thread to any hope for their future. Until we address the problems in our society which have resulted in children being poorly housed or homeless, poorly fed, poorly educated and lacking adequate health care, we, as professionals in the field of pediatric care, will be continuing to hand out band-aids when what the patient needs is major surgery.

GENERATIONAL COMPARISONS

You have all heard the comparison of the typical school discipline problems from just a few years ago—running in the hall, chewing gum, not adhering to the dress code—to the concerns of today—guns in the classroom, teenage pregnancy, suicide, drugs.

These generational differences were pointed out in the Code Blue Report of the National Commission on the Role of the School and the Community in Improving Adolescent Health.

In 1965, there were roughly 4 cases of gonorrhea and syphilis for every 1,000 American

adolescents. In 1985, there were 12. CDC estimates that 2.5 million adolescents each year contract a sexually transmitted disease.

In 1965, 16.7 out of every 1,000 unmarried teens age 15-19 gave birth during that year. In 1985, 31.6 out of every 1,000 did.

In 1950, the rate of youths age 14-17 who were arrested during that year was 4 per 1,000. In 1985, the rate was 118 per thousand.

In the 1950s, less than 5% of youth experimented with an illicit drug before entering 10th grade. In 1987, over 30% of youth had done so.

In 1965, 9.8% of all children under 18 years lived in single-parent homes. In 1985, 21% did.

In 1960, 39% of mothers with school-aged children were working outside the home. In 1987, 70% did. (5)

Everywhere we look, the statistics paint a dismal picture of how our children are doing.

Every day 135,000 American students bring guns to school, and every day 30 children are wounded and 10 children die from guns. (6)

The homicide rate has doubled among 10 to 14 year olds during the past 20 years and is the leading cause of death among black 15-19 year olds. (7)

Over the past 20 years the suicide rate has tripled among 10 to 14 year olds and doubled among 15 to 19 year olds. (7)

Abuse and neglect increased 74% during the past decade, and adolescents experience more abuse and neglect than younger children do. Every year over 2 million children and adolescents are reported abused or neglected, and hundreds of thousands more go unreported. (7)

Sexual activity is occurring at younger and younger ages, resulting in more than 1 million adolescents getting pregnant every year and an epidemic of sexually transmitted diseases, one of which is AIDS. Gonorrhea rates are actually higher among sexually active 15 to 19 year olds than among 20 to 24 year olds. (5, 7)

In the wealthiest nation on earth, we will "trash" nearly 40,000 children this year who will die before their first birthday. According to a 1989 White House Task Force Report, at least 25% of the deaths could be prevented. One-third of our infants and toddlers will go without adequate childhood immunizations. The incidence of preventable communicable diseases has soared. Children are once again dying. Millions of children are without basic health insurance and access to health care. (2)

POVERTY IN AMERICA

Poverty rates among young families have almost doubled since the mid-1960s, and middle-income families report greater difficulty making ends meet. (3)

Contrary to what you might think, most poor children are white. White children saw their poverty rate increase the most during the past decade. One in seven white children is poor. But, minority children are more likely to be poor. Nearly 50% of all African-American children and over one-third of Hispanic children live in poverty. (1)

Families on average have less income on which to bring up their children. Growth in real wages virtually halted in 1973, and families today spend a higher proportion of their incomes on housing, transportation, health care, higher education, and taxes. (3)

Minority incomes are substantially below white incomes. The only families with children to make gains during the 1980s were those at the top of the income spectrum. Families with average median incomes of \$35,000 or less experienced a loss of real income during the 1980s. The poorest families

sustained almost a 13% decrease in their median incomes. (1)

Again, contrary to common belief, in most poor families the father is present. However, the chance of being poor increases when there is only one parent. Rising divorce rates and births to single women of all ages have dramatically increased the number and proportion of children being raised in one-parent families. Almost 13 million children live in a single-parent family—almost double the number 20 years ago. We know that a large portion of the 12 million children of the 5-H Club are living in single parent homes. Minority children are more likely than white children to live in one-parent families. More than half of African-American children, nearly one-third of Hispanic, and almost one-fifth of white children live today in single-parent families. (1)

In response to the increased difficulties of supporting a family on one wage, mothers in two-parent families have moved steadily into the work force. In 1970 only 39% of families with children had mothers in the work force, but by 1990 that proportion had risen to 61%. American families today have less time to devote to the supervision, education, and nurturing of their children than they did two decades ago. The Ozzie and Harriet family, which was the norm less than 30 years ago, has now become the exception. (1)

AMERICA'S FUTURE

If anyone thinks this is not their problem, let me remind you our failure to prevent poverty and address the economic needs of families had led to the social ills we know so well—more crime and delinquency, more teenage childbearing, more unhealthy babies, higher drop-out rates, more substance abuse and mental illness, more child abuse and neglect, and lower productivity among the working-age population. These problems are costly, in terms of tax expenditures as well as human terms. To salvage this disposable population requires significant expenditures for treatment of chronic health conditions and disabilities, special education, foster care, and welfare. For those we cannot salvage, we have a human land-fill called "prison" which is getting fuller and fuller. (3)

If I haven't gotten your attention yet, let me explain another reason why we've got to stop fighting poverty with band-aids. Since 1960, the proportion of children in the U.S. population has declined dramatically. In little more than a decade—the labor force will begin to shrink in little more than a decade. (3) Although children made up over one-third of the population in 1970, in 1990 they constituted only about one-fourth. We all have heard about the aging of America. The aging of America reflects the convergence of three trends. First, individual Americans are having fewer children than their parents did. Second, baby boomers, those born between 1946 and 1964, are now heading into middle age and out of the primary child-bearing years. And, third more older Americans are living longer. (1) In the foreseeable future, a declining number of workers will have to support a growing number of retirees, you and me! (3)

In the fact of an aging America, we more than ever need our children to be healthy, skilled, confident, and caring. Today's children are tomorrow's parents, workers, and leaders. The baby born this year will be entering the work force just as the first baby boomers near retirement. While they may not be adequately represented in the politics of today, these children will pay taxes and serve our communities and nation in the

early 21st century. (1) I plan on being around then, don't you?

So, how do we go from a society that treats its most valuable resource as non-biodegradable, disposable trash to one in which every child is truly viewed as the most precious gift from God?

SIX PRESCRIPTIONS

As a pediatrician and chief state health officer, let me offer my six prescriptions which, I believe, will secure a future for our children.

Universal, early childhood education to prepare our children to learn and achieve, removing some of the disadvantages that hold them back. At age four, a child knows half as much as he will ever know. Why, then, are we waiting until kindergarten to intervene academically? Given the success of Head Start in improving school performance, there is no excuse for not making such resources available to all children who need them.

Comprehensive health and family life education should be taught to all children, starting in kindergarten and continuing through high school. Of course, instruction should be appropriate to the child's ability to understand and need to know. But we must not be timid about facing our obligations even to the youngest children. After all, the messages they get from television and videos, older siblings, and even parents, don't respect their ages. They need and should be encouraged to take responsibility for as much of their lives as they are capable.

They need to know about human nutrition and physiology and the risks of substance abuse—tobacco use, alcohol consumption, abuse of prescription medications (more than narcotics alone), and experimentation with substances they may be offered by friends or strangers.

If the same way they need to be armed with knowledge about human reproductive biology and development. The risks of early and unprotected sexual activity are effectively learned in such a context. We must do all we can to empower our children with useful facts and resources.

Parents need more support in nurturing, caring for and teaching their children. So many of our social problems are worsened by parents' uninformed attitudes toward health and inappropriate behavior toward their children. Instruction, counsel, and peer discussion ought to be available. For our future parents, today's children, this can start in the comprehensive health and family life education mentioned above. For today's parents, accessible programs must be devised for their busy lives. Many resources can be tapped, including churches, civic organizations, work sites, schools and communities.

Male responsibility needs reinforcement. Family planning and sex education have traditionally focused on young females. This strategy appears to absolve young males of sexual responsibility. As with young females, many young males have few opportunities other than procreation to prove themselves. Accordingly, they must also be given opportunities for growth and self-expression in other arenas of life.

Comprehensive school-based clinics are needed to provide medical care, including family planning services, to all teens. They are logical partners of comprehensive health and family life education. If children are taught health promotion and primary prevention and health care, there will be demand for such services. Providing them in schools makes them nearly universally accessible.

Opportunities for higher education should be guaranteed. All children who make good grades, exhibit good citizenship, and have a low family income should be guaranteed assistance at state-supported colleges. Our society needs educated, critical minds, and our children need opportunities to develop fully.

I am pleased to report that many states, including Arkansas, have recently taken steps toward filling these prescriptions.

LEADERSHIP IS VITAL

How can you start filling these prescriptions rather than just passing out band-aids. Broaden your vision, become a leader. Let's consider more fully the word "Leader."

Now, discussing leaders and leadership is a good way to fill an entire afternoon. People will variously argue that there are no leaders, there are few leaders, there are enough leaders, or there are too many leaders of the wrong sort.

Often we see leadership as a personal quality, something that a person has intrinsically as part of his or her personality, a set of qualities that make him or her stand out. We say that someone is a born leader, a natural leader, or that they have innate leadership qualities and abilities.

It is often hard to imagine ourselves as leaders. We view leaders as "super-people", able to keep going seemingly without limits of time or energy. Thus, people who lead ordinary lives with a job (or two or three), kids, aging parents, mortgages, plumbing that leaks and a car that breaks down may be discouraged from ever trying to be a leader.

However, my personal experience has taught me that there is nothing mystical about being a leader. To begin with, it's hard work at best. Secondly, leaders take a lot of flak. Third, being a leader can be an isolating experience.

But, I believe, that to be effective in saving our nation as we know it, we must be leaders. Let's consider more fully the word "LEADER".

The "L" in leader is for learn. You have to learn what the needs and problems are. You must identify all available allies—institutions (schools, churches, hospitals), service agencies, key businesses, community leaders and political leaders. You must also learn who may present obstacles—learning includes getting to know the opposition. Then, try to identify someone who can help you "bridge the gap." Often, leadership means finding that key figure who is willing and able to stand up for us at critical times.

The "E" in leader is for educate. There are those who feel the programs I want for children are morally wrong. I believe, it's morally wrong for children to go hungry, it's morally wrong for children to be cold, and it's morally wrong for children to be poor. If we had a perfect society with no hungry children and a wonderful place for everyone to live, they would not need the programs I advocate. I often ask people if they were willing to let a baby die of hunger just because his mother did something wrong? Once educated, the majority of people support our programs.

The "A" in leader is for advocacy. Sometimes we get so busy protecting, working, and planning our own particular programs that we forget we are a part of the whole. It takes many people's efforts to make programs work. It takes the schools, the mothers, the fathers, the churches, everybody in the community. We must attract these diverse groups in order to build a true infrastructure for our programs. Each agency or group must work with the others, playing its

own unique role. Over and over again, super programs without adequate infrastructures have simply disappeared with the departure of their founders.

The "D" in leader is for design. We have to design and develop programs that are unique and fit the special needs of individual communities. This is illustrated by an old Chinese Fable.

"Once upon a time a monkey and a fish were caught up in a great flood. The monkey, agile and experienced, had the good fortune to scramble up a tree to safety. As he looked down into the raging waters, he saw a fish struggling against the swift current. Filled with a humanitarian desire to help his less fortunate fellow, he reached down and scooped the fish from the water. To the monkey's surprise, the fish was not very grateful for this aid."

Many communities have a long history of outsiders coming into their community to "rescue" their members from some inherent danger. Although well meaning, many of these programs are ineffective because they do not involve community members in their planning and implementation. (9)

This leads us to the second "E" in leader, which is for enable. Communities do not want to be told by outsiders what their problems are and how to solve them. In the spirit of community pride and self-determination, they want assistance to enable them to help themselves.

Local leaders have a right to expect the "experts" to offer assessment and assistance, but unless they assume responsibility for making something happen in their hometowns, the efforts will be to no avail. We must enable people to overcome their problems.

Finally, the "R" in leader is for responsibility and risk-taking. It is our responsibility to reach out and that often involves taking risks. We may see risk as inevitably ending in ruin, injury, hurt and loss and, therefore, as something to avoid.

We should, though, think of a mistake as an occasional mis-step in our path toward our goal. Viewed in this light, mistakes can even be positive. Remember, they are an important aspect of self-education; there's almost always a valuable lesson to be learned from failure. A perfect record is not a statement of invincibility, but more likely an indication that we simply are not taking enough risks. (10)

LESSONS FOR THE 1990'S

As leaders each of us shoulder tremendous responsibility. We must draw upon our life experience to do what we know matters. We must remember the lessons of our generation. My friend, and another advocate for children, Marian Wright Edelman, President of Children's Defense Fund, has synthesized her experiences and submitted "Ten Lessons To Help Us Through the 1990s." They bear repeating.

Lesson 1: There is no free lunch. We must not feel entitled to anything we don't sweat and struggle for. Each of us must take the initiative to create opportunity. A people unable or unwilling to share, to juggle difficult, competing demands, or to make hard choices and sacrifices may be incapable of taking courageous action to rebuild our families and communities and to prepare for the future.

Lesson 2: Set goals and work quietly and systematically toward them. We must resist quick-fix, simplistic answers. We must not talk big and act small. We can't get bogged down in our ego needs. You can achieve a lot if you don't mind working hard and giving others the credit.

Lesson 3: Assign yourself. Don't wait around for your boss or your friend to direct you to do what you are capable of figuring out and doing yourself. Don't do as little as you can to get by. If you see a need, don't ask, "Why doesn't somebody do something?" Ask, "Why don't I do something?"

Lesson 4: Never work just for money. Don't confuse wealth or fame with character. Don't confuse legality with morality. Don't tolerate corruption. And demand that those who represent you do the same.

Lesson 5: Don't be afraid of taking risks or being criticized. An anonymous sage said, "If you don't want to be criticized, don't say anything, do anything, or be anything." It doesn't matter how many times you fall down, it's how many times you get up.

Lesson 6: Take parenting and family life seriously. Our leaders mouth family values we do not practice. Seventy nations provide medical care and financial assistance to all pregnant women; we aren't one of them. Seventeen industrialized nations have paid maternity leave programs; we are not one of them.

Lesson 7: Remember and help America remember that the fellowship of human beings is more important than the fellowship of race and class and gender in a democratic society. We must realize that our country's ability to compete and lead in the new century is as inextricably intertwined with our poor and nonwhite children as with white privileged ones.

Lesson 8: Don't confuse style with substance or political charm with decency or sound policy. Words alone will not meet the children's or the nation's needs. Leadership and different priorities will.

Lesson 9: Listen for the sound of the genuine within yourself. There are so many competing demands in our lives that many of us never learn to be quiet enough to hear the sound of the genuine within ourselves or other people.

Lesson 10: Never think life is not worth living or that you cannot make a difference. In other words, never give up. I know how discouraging it can be to struggle year after year with the same issues. But we have to realize that it isn't necessary to "win" immediately in order to make a difference. (4)

Sojourner Truth, an illiterate slave woman who hated slavery and the second class treatment of women, was heckled one day by an old white man. "Old woman, do you think that your talk about slavery does any good? Why, I don't care any more for your talk than I do for the bite of a flea." Perhaps not," Sojourner rejoined, "but the Lord willing, I'll keep you scratching."

Enough committed fleas can make even the biggest dog uncomfortable and transform even the biggest nation. (4)

America can no longer afford to spend more than any other country per capita on personal health care, yet have 34 million citizens in her borders with little or no health coverage. During the past hour, we as a nation spent 33.7 million dollars on our national defense. We spent 23 million dollars on the S&L bail out. Yet, we only spent 1.3 million dollars on our children's health.

Unlike murder or suicide, poverty is a slow death. For the 12 million children in America who are suffering from a slow death, I challenge you to get involved. Time is of the essence.

As I look around the room today, I realize we really are an aging America. But, a society grows great when old men plant trees under whose shade they know they'll never sit.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, I think it is important that we not lose sight of why we are here, what this nomination is about, what the job description of the Surgeon General is, and why it is so vitally important that we confirm this nomination today, that we do so with dispatch, that we get beyond this argument and recognize that Dr. Elders has passed the credentials test, the competence test, the character test, and that she does deserve confirmation.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, I have talked to the manager of the bill. I was to speak next. I yield myself 5 minutes off his time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, I rise today in support of Dr. Joycelyn Elders, the President's nominee for Surgeon General of the United States.

Is she controversial—yes, she is, as is usually the case when a strong and talented individual has the courage to take strong and candid stands.

The basic question is, "Is Dr. Elders qualified to promote the protection and advancement of the Nation's physical and mental health?" The answer I am receiving from public health professionals is a resounding yes.

The answer I am receiving from diverse groups such as the national PTA, the American Medical Association, NARAL, and the National Education Association is a resounding "yes".

Mr. President, at this stage in my speech I would like to submit for the RECORD two letters of support I received; one from Elizabeth Brown, community health supervisor in Washington County, OR, and one from Kate Michelman, the president of the National Abortion Rights Action League.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NARAL,

Washington, DC, July 26, 1993.

Hon. BOB PACKWOOD,

U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR PACKWOOD: I am writing to urge you to vote in support of the nomination of an outstanding woman who will bring a realistic and tough approach to the health problems of all Americans, Dr. Joycelyn Elders.

When you are considering your position on this nominee, please consider the unimpeachable credentials she brings to the position of Surgeon General and the stellar array of mainstream organizations, including the American Medical Association, which support her. The voices raised against her are those of the extreme right, which refuse to acknowledge the need to deal with, not merely to wish away, the problems of unplanned teen pregnancy and sexually transmitted diseases.

Dr. Elders will be a dynamic, forceful leader for change, who has pledged to work to make every child a wanted child. This is a goal we all should share. I ask that you sup-

port Dr. Elders, a nominee who deserves your vote.

Thank you for your consideration of this important issue. If you have any questions or comments, please contact the Legislative/Political department at NARAL, 202-973-3000.

Sincerely,

KATE MICHELMAN,

President.

WASHINGTON COUNTY, OR,

August 2, 1993.

Hon. BOB PACKWOOD,

Russell Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR: I am writing to strongly encourage your support of President Clinton's nomination of Dr. M. Joycelyn Elders as U.S. Surgeon General.

As I'm sure you know, Dr. Elders, the Arkansas State Health Commissioner, has had a long and illustrious career in public health. She is a certified pediatric endocrinologist and is presently the President of the Association of State and Territorial Health Officials (ASHTO). In addition, she serves on many councils and commissions in the public and private sectors, including the National Advisory Commission on Rural Health and the National Institute of Medicine's Health Promotion Disease Prevention Committee.

Many national organizations have recognized Dr. Elders for her outstanding work. Her honors include: the American Medical Association's Outstanding Public Health Professional, the National Education Association's Award for Creative Leadership in Women's Rights, and the National Governor's Association Distinguished Service Award.

Dr. Elders is an outspoken advocate for children and the underserved. She is to be praised for her efforts to increase children's immunization rates and reduce teen pregnancy.

I am proud to be counted among those urging prompt confirmation of this courageous public health crusader.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH A. BROWN,

Community Health Supervisor.

Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, Dr. Elders is the wakeup call we need for the preventative health of our Nation, the wakeup call we would sometimes like to ignore in our daily lives.

We would all like to believe that the hope for our country—our children—are guided by us as parents, by our churches, by our schools, and by our scholars.

In a perfect world, this would be so. But, by her very background, and medical training and public health experience, Dr. Elders knows firsthand that we do not live in that perfect world, that we are losing some of our children, disenfranchised and diseased before they can become solid, productive citizens.

She is the voice that reaches out to them, and the voice that they heard when she was the director of Arkansas' health department.

And, as president of the association of State and Territorial Health Officials, she is the voice that the health experts from every State in the Union, my State and yours, listen to for public health care guidance.

Dr. Elders uses her judgment, based on all her skills as a highly trained doctor of pediatric endocrinology and her life experiences, to urge us all toward a healthier life, because her first priority is preventative medicine.

That is the message that she expounds loud and clear and the wakeup call that we sometimes do not want to hear—preventative medicine.

Her courageous initiative against teen pregnancy in Arkansas includes school-based clinics and a public information campaign.

She is a tireless advocate for availability of family planning and prevention of sexually transmitted diseases.

Her expertise in pediatrics served Arkansas well when she moved aggressively to wage a campaign for healthy babies and the availability of preventative health services, such as immunizations, for young children.

Dr. Elders should be allowed to continue with her courage and vision in tackling tough and controversial health problems for the entire Nation—she is the wakeup call we must hear and the reality we must recognize.

I hope that the Senate would overwhelmingly confirm her. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I yield the Senator from Missouri 6 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

IN SUPPORT OF CONFIRMATION OF DR. JOYCELYN ELDERS

Mr. DANFORTH. Mr. President, I have an overwhelming, almost insurmountable predisposition to confirm presidential nominees, virtually any nominees. Because of this predisposition, I did not think it necessary to visit with Dr. Elders when she offered to come to my office. But she did come, and we did visit, and I am glad we did. For that visit makes it possible, just barely, for me to vote to confirm Dr. Elders.

An office visit of 20 minutes to half an hour is, of course, scant basis for an informed judgment on a nominee. But when one has a strong predisposition to confirm, one grabs at any straw and indulges any presumption. So I will presume and hope that what I saw in Dr. Elders during that visit was an accurate impression of the person.

I found Dr. Elders startlingly unqualified for the position of Surgeon General. To me she seemed at once unthinking and dazzled by her own persona. When I asked what the most important thing was that she wanted to accomplish as Surgeon General, she said "education." She was not speaking of health education or medical education—just education. This is an important subject, to be sure. The problem is that it is not within the portfolio of Surgeon General.

She then changed subjects and announced that she did not want any unwanted babies to come into the world.

I understand that Dr. Elders is aggressively pro-choice, as is the President. I am pro-life, but that difference for me would not decide on a confirmation vote. But Dr. Elders seemed to be announcing a position beyond pro-choice and verging on a search and destroy mission of the unwanted. This in the office of a pro-life Senator.

At the end of the meeting, I inquired about buttons Dr. Elders and her entourage were wearing. The logo was a lightning bolt. She told me she had said to some assemblage that if they would be the thunder, she would be the lightning.

At the end of the meeting, my intention to vote for the nominee was unshaken. Dr. Elders struck me as unimpressive and foolish, but I do not think the republic will fall if our next Surgeon General is unimpressive and foolish.

Nor was I shaken by various claims I later heard about Dr. Elders' liberalism. Philosophy is to be a matter of Presidential prerogative. For 8 months, President Clinton has gone out of his way to identify himself with the left wing of the Democratic party. He deserves an administration with whom he is philosophically comfortable.

I have one concern and only one about Dr. Elders that has led me to consider opposing her confirmation. That concern is her statements that could be construed as religious bigotry. She has attacked the Catholic Church as "celibate" and "male dominated." She has called abortion opponents, "non-Christians with slave master mentalities." She has appeared to combine religious intolerance with behavioral tolerance saying, "We've taught our children in driver's education what to do in the front seat, and now we've got to teach them what to do in the back seat."

I have no doubt that had a white Catholic male made statements comparable to those of Dr. Elders, such a nominee would have no chance of confirmation. The good reason for this is that bigotry and racism have no place in our society, and certainly none in our Government.

But, as we must be quick to condemn intolerance, so we must be slow to attribute intolerance where none is intended.

This is a point I tried to make on the floor just after our votes on whether to extend patent protection for the United Daughters of the Confederacy.

Certainly, it is possible to construe statements by Dr. Elders as religious bigotry. And under such a construction she should be defeated. But I choose to believe, on the basis of my short visit with her, that offense should not be taken, because no bigotry was intended. I choose to believe that the person who made the statements about the Catholic Church and about pro-life, religious people, was the same person I

thought I saw in my office, and that she made them without thinking. I choose to believe that Dr. Elders is foolhardy and that she loves the sound of her own voice. Those, to me, are not sufficient obstacles to confirmation.

I will vote to confirm Dr. Elders.

Mr. METZENBAUM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Breaux). The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. METZENBAUM. On behalf of Senator KENNEDY, I yield myself 10 minutes.

I rise to offer my strong support for Dr. Joycelyn Elders to be Surgeon General of the United States. She comes before the Senate as an eminently qualified candidate, capable of meeting the challenges of Surgeon General of the United States.

She has had a distinguished career in pediatrics as a physician, a researcher, and as a teacher of future doctors.

She has tackled difficult health problems in the State of Arkansas with courage and with commitment. Joycelyn Elders has confronted adversity throughout her life. She has faced abject poverty. She has endured the hardship of segregation. She has risen in a profession dominated by men. And after clearing each hurdle in her life, she has emerged stronger than ever.

Now she faces another hurdle: The far right has attempted to derail her nomination for months, long before President Clinton sent her name to the Senate. They have spread endless rumors and innuendo attacking her and her family. My response is that we have investigated every allegation, and she, in my opinion, should be confirmed as Surgeon General.

We have listened to the distortions of Dr. Elders' record and, frankly, we have come away with a better understanding of who Dr. Joycelyn Elders is. She is a remarkable and a dedicated leader. She is not about abortion; she is about abstinence and preventing unplanned pregnancies. She is not about putting condoms on school lunch trays; she is about comprehensive health education for children. She is about early childhood education to help children get a good start on life. She is a tireless advocate for children who are part of what she calls the "5-H Club"—the hungry, the healthless, the homeless, the huggless and, yes, the hopeless.

Yet, some groups have labeled her a "radical." I suspect this is because she has made her views on sex education, condom distribution, and abortion well known. It is no secret that she has been outspoken and plans to use the office of the Surgeon General as her bully pulpit. However, the number one doctor in the country should not be afraid to step on some toes. The number one doctor in the country should not yield to any interest group, industry, or association, when the health care of the

American public is on the line. The number one doctor in the country should not sugar-coat the message when our children's future is at stake.

The Surgeon General needs to be an aggressive advocate for the American public. Former Surgeon General, Dr. C. Everett Koop, fit this mold. He was a tough, uncompromising leader in the medical community. When his own administration failed to tackle the AIDS crisis early on, Dr. Koop stepped forward. That is the type of leadership we need in the office of the Surgeon General and Dr. Joycelyn Elders fits this bill. She is tenacious, she is determined and, frankly, her actions speak louder than her words.

As director of health in Arkansas, she has improved the immunization rates for 2-year-olds; increased childhood screenings, expanded HIV prevention services and cancer prevention services for women; she launched a sickle cell screening program for newborns; and improved access to community based health clinics by improving transportation to those clinics.

So, Mr. President, it is no wonder that an overwhelming number of organizations have publicly voiced their support for Dr. Elders. The AMA has stated that Dr. Elders "brings the requisite experience, knowledge and commitment to provide leadership as Surgeon General."

The National PTA has come out saying, "In the interest of providing quality preventative health care services to younger Americans, the National PTA supports Dr. Joycelyn Elders' nomination for Surgeon General of the United States."

The American Heart Association, the American Lung Association and the American Cancer Society, have all come out in favor of Dr. Elders. Several church and religious groups have voiced their support of Dr. Elders, including the United Methodist Church and Society and the Presbyterian Church USA, and B'nai B'rith. In fact, over 340 organizations have come out in favor of Dr. Elders.

Yet, this nomination has been delayed by one stalling tactic after another. Her confirmation hearing was postponed 1 week. When she finally appeared before the committee, she was delayed 3 more hours. When finally given the chance, she dutifully answered every question posed by Senators and then answered over 200 questions submitted in writing.

Throughout this process, the allegations have been refuted, the questions answered. Dr. Elders is ready to serve her country, and she deserves that chance.

I urge my colleagues to support her confirmation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, during the earlier part of the discussion of my friend and colleague from Oklahoma, there were a number of issues that he raised. I will take some of the time of the Senate, and perhaps this afternoon, in responding in greater detail to those measures. But I do think that it is particularly important to respond to the allegations and charges that have been made about Dr. Elders and her views about the Catholic Church or about organized religion. I want to just put as complete a record into the Senate discussion now what I think would benefit the Members in making judgments and decisions about her statements and also her actions.

Dr. Elders' remarks need to be put in context, especially since they have been blown so far out of proportion. Her opponents have confused two separate issues. Dr. Elders' comments on the actions of the church in condoning slavery and the oppression of Native Americans and other social wrongs had absolutely nothing to do with the Catholic Church.

Instead it was a response to a vicious television ad run by right-wing, Protestant church groups attacking the pro-choice movement. Let me read from the newspaper report summarizing the ad, and I think on hearing this summary, my colleagues will understand why Dr. Elders felt she needed to respond so strongly.

I ask unanimous consent to include the complete article in the RECORD. This is from the Arkansas Democrat-Gazette newspaper.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Democrat-Gazette, Jan. 15, 1992]

CHURCH'S ANTI-ABORTION AD ENRAGES PRO-CHOICE SIDE

(By Jane Fullerton)

A Little Rock television advertisement comparing abortion to oppressions such as slavery and the Holocaust has angered abortion rights advocates.

"It's another example of the extremist and distorted message that the anti-choice forces try to put upon the public," said Kimberly Collins, who heads the Arkansas Coalition for Choice.

The Fellowship Bible Church is running the 30-second commercial on the three local network affiliates, said the Little Rock church's pastor, Dr. Robert Lewis.

The ad coincides with the anniversary of the U.S. Supreme Court's Roe vs. Wade decision that legalized abortion Jan. 22, 1973. Both sides plan rallies this weekend in Little Rock to mark the occasion.

The ad shows photographs of an Indian, a black man with a rope around his neck and prisoners behind barbed wire in a Nazi concentration camp.

A female voice says: "Not so long ago we were told these people were not fully human."

As the picture changes to that of a 10-week-old fetus, the voice continues: "Now we're being told these people aren't fully human either."

"Hasn't our history taught us anything? Speak up Arkansas for our unborn children. They are people too."

Lewis said church members wrote and produced the commercial to reach people who are undecided about abortion.

"We wanted to speak more directly to the community, without it going through other sources, in a way that would capture people's attention," he said.

Dan Kirkpatrick, president of the Little Rock advertising firm of Kirkpatrick Williams and Associates, said the ad would force people to confront their feelings about abortion. His agency helped the church buy the air time.

"It gets you off the fence," Kirkpatrick said. "That's the whole point."

Collins said the comparisons between human rights abuses and abortion are inaccurate and abhorrent.

"The significant difference is that the fetus is a potential human being and the slave was a human being," she said.

Zenobia Harris, past president of the Arkansas Black Women's Health Project, also criticized the ad.

"It is an outrage that they are willing to compare the prochoice position to the horrors of concentration camps, the lynching of African-Americans or the cruelty to native Americans."

But Lewis said the ad draws a valid parallel between different forms of oppression.

"We think this commercial upholds the intrinsic worth, not only of unborn children, but of all humans," he said.

Anne Dierks, who heads Arkansas Right-to-Life, said she frequently compares abortion to slavery and the Holocaust. Although she had not seen the ad, she agreed with its premise.

"We surely haven't learned anything from history," she said.

Lewis would not say how much the ad cost. He said that was "totally irrelevant." But he said it would run indefinitely on Little Rock stations KARK, Channel 4; KATV, Channel 7; and KTHV, Channel 11.

He said the church has produced several other ads.

Mr. KENNEDY. To paraphrase, a Little Rock television advertisement compared abortion to oppression, such as slavery and the Holocaust and abortion rights advocates. The Fellowship Bible Church is running a 30-second commercial on the three local network affiliates, said Little Rock Church pastor Dr. Robert Lewis.

The ad coincides with the anniversary of the Supreme Court Roe versus Wade decision that legalized abortion on January 27, 1973. Both sides plan rallies this weekend in Little Rock to mark the occasion. The timing was to mark the 20th anniversary of this decision. Groups that supported it had rallies indicating support for the decision; those opposed did likewise.

And then we had the running of this particular television 30-second commercial. The ad shows photographs of an Indian, a black man with a rope around his neck and prisoners behind barbed wire in a Nazi concentration camp. A female voice says: "Not so long ago, we were told these people were not fully human." As the picture changes to that of a 10-week fetus, the voice continues: "Now we are being

told these people are not fully human either. Hasn't our history taught us anything? Speak up, Arkansas, for our unborn children. They are people, too."

Lewis said church members wrote and produced the commercial to reach people who are undecided about abortion.

So that is the ad.

Having responded to this ad, Dr. Elders went on to discuss those who opposed the prochoice movement, and she listed—and I quote: "a male-dominated, celibate church" as one of the opponents of the prochoice movement. She also included the male-dominated medical societies which at the time of the Roe versus Wade decision had also opposed any prochoice movement, and she also included male-dominated legislative leaders who opposed any choice. Those were the various groups that had opposed the Roe versus Wade decision that she listed—those three groups: male-dominated legislative leaders, male-dominated medical societies, and male-dominated, celibate church. The Catholic Church opposes the prochoice position and Dr. Elders realized the language she used might have inadvertently given offense to Catholics, and she reached out to correct any misunderstanding.

In late January, early February, responding to some concerns about Elders' remarks expressed by Father Ralph West, a priest in the town of Bigelow, AR, a population of 150, Elders contacts Archbishop McDonald to set up a meeting to discuss her remarks with him and try to clarify her statements. In late February 1992, Dr. Elders met with Father West, Archbishop McDonald, and Father West's brother, who is a Methodist minister, to discuss her statement, and Dr. Elders apologized in person. This is January, February, 1992. We are not talking about a nomination conversion. This is just within proximity of these comments and these statements and this kind of an ad.

Subsequent to her conversation with Archbishop McDonald, Elders sent Archbishop McDonald a letter thanking him for the chance to meet with him and stressing she had "the utmost respect for Roman Catholic Church and its followers" and apologizing again for the use of the term "male dominated." I will include the letter in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARKANSAS DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,

Little Rock, AR, February 26, 1992.

Bishop ANDREW McDONALD,

Little Rock, AR.

DEAR BISHOP McDONALD: I appreciated the opportunity to discuss important issues of concern facing the citizenry of our State. I want to thank you for taking the time out of your busy schedule to meet with Father Host, my brother and me to address some concerns raised by Father West regarding an address I made at the Pro-Choice rally on January 18, 1992.

I wanted you to know that the major emphasis of my effort has been to protect and improve the health of all citizens of our state. My initiatives, since I have been Health Director, have included ensuring:

- (1) Early childhood education for all children,
- (2) Health education in schools from K-12,
- (3) Teaching parents parenting skills,
- (4) Teaching young males responsibility for their actions,
- (5) Providing comprehensive, primary preventive health services for all children that is accessible, affordable, acceptable and age-appropriate, and finally,
- (6) Providing opportunity for young people to attend college if they have done well in school and desire to do so with the idea that college is cheaper than prisons.

As discussed, in my statement which was quoted in the media, I did not have any preconceived malice or intent to blaspheme the Roman Catholic Church. I have the utmost respect for the Roman Catholic Church and its followers. If offense was taken at my use of the term "male-dominated" rather than "male-governed," please accept my sincere apology.

Once again, many thanks for the opportunity to discuss this important issue with you.

Sincerely,

H. JOYCELYN ELDERS, M.D.,

Director.

Mr. KENNEDY. She points out a number of the constructive works that the church had been involved in and then mentions in the next to the last paragraph as discussed in my statement which was quoted in the media:

I did not have any preconceived malice or intent to blaspheme the Roman Catholic Church. I have the utmost respect for the Roman Catholic Church and its followers. The offense was taken at use of "male dominated" rather than "male governed." Please accept my sincere apology.

She sent a copy of that letter to Father West.

I know it has been represented that she did not apologize, did not show any kind of indication or sensitivity to this issue. I think the record is quite clear that she expressed that position to Father West orally and then wrote to Father West's archbishop which is Archbishop McDonald for using the term male dominated.

Then in July 14, 1993—this is now 1993; the February we were talking about was in 1992—in a letter from Archbishop Keeler to President Clinton not released by the archbishop until August 31, Keeler complains to President Clinton that Dr. Elders' characterization of the Catholic Church as celibate, male dominated is contemptuous and also complains that she suggests that prolife advocates are not interested in life beyond the womb.

On Friday, July 23, we have the hearings and there were no questions at that time that were asked by Senators concerning the speech. On Wednesday, July 28, in written questions Senator COATS asked Dr. Elders whether she made comments.

In response to the television advertisement comparing the prochoice

movement to the Holocaust and slavery and asking to apologize to remarks made during the address, in response to Senator COATS, Dr. Elders confirmed the statements concerning the TV ad, indicating she apologized to Bishop McDonald of Arkansas both in person and in writing.

Now we have July 30, which is when Elders was approved by the committee and on August 4 the nomination goes to the floor.

Then on August 5, President Clinton responds to Archbishop Keeler's July 14 letter, and that was not released until July 31, and stresses that he had known Dr. Elders personally for many years and that as a religious person she respects the deeply held beliefs of others.

Then Dr. Elders responded to a question from Senator LOTT about religious bigotry and stated:

Although my speech in January 1992 did not specifically mention the Roman Catholic Church, I understand that some Catholics may have taken offense at my remarks.

That was not specifically mentioning the Roman Catholic Church offense to my remarks. In case of an offense I apologize.

As someone who has experienced prejudice firsthand, I reiterated to Bishop McDonald my abhorrence for bigotry in any form. I do not condone bigotry, and I will not tolerate bias and prejudice in the administration of any programs under my jurisdiction as Surgeon General, should I be confirmed.

August 5, Cardinal O'Connor of New York writes to Senator D'AMATO—and there are other dates that follow. But I mention one in particular, August 5, 1993, in a personal and confidential communication to Archbishop Keeler, president of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops subsequently released by Archbishop Keeler on August 31, Dr. Elders apologized to Keeler and stated:

I abhor bigotry in all its forms. I grew up in a segregated community and know first hand the baleful effects of prejudice and discrimination *** I do not consider myself a bigot, and I regret any impression that I may have left to the contrary *** I never meant to malign or blaspheme the Catholic Church *** I respect and admire the many contributions that church-based programs and church-inspired people have made to education, health care, and social justice.

Then in letters to Senator BIDEN, Elders restated: "I sincerely apologize for any member of the Catholic Church whom I offended."

So, Mr. President, I think what we have to do is look at the full context of these comments and statements. All of us certainly know of times where we may have selected other words to express views that should be more carefully considered, and I think that Dr. Elders has certainly indicated that on that occasion she wishes she had. But it is very clear I think from reviewing the record the context in which her reaction came and also the extraordinary degree to which she went to try and indicate to those who might have been offended by her very sincere regrets for any comments that could have, would

have, and did offend individuals. I think it is appropriate, and I will just end with this kind of comment and review the extraordinary strong beliefs of Dr. Elders in her God and in her religion.

She has been a lifelong Methodist. She received her scholarship, as I mentioned earlier, from the United Methodist Church. She attended a religious-affiliated college, a Methodist institution. She has been a member of the Hunter United Methodist Church, served on numerous boards, and has been an active member of the lay religious community.

She has been a keynote speaker of the global meeting of the United Methodist Church. The Methodist Church has selected her as "Lay Person of the Year" in 1993. She serves on the board of Camp Aldersgate, a Methodist summer camp for children with medical disabilities, and has been an active member of that community.

She is honorary chairman of the Methodist Church's Shalom project, designed to help end inner-city violence. Her brother is a Methodist minister.

In reviewing her total life and her family's life, her devotion to her church and her religion, the nonexistence of any form of bigotry is so clear and so evident and so powerful that I do think it is only fair to understand that tradition and that strong commitment and those very deep beliefs, and the context in which these comments were made, to try to be fair to Dr. Elders.

I cannot help but believe that any fair evaluation of the totality of her life's experience will show one strongly committed to be free of bigotry and prejudice.

And I can see why, under certain circumstances, people could take strong offense. I do not think there is any question that people could. Her efforts to try to respond to that, I think, are very compelling and are a real reflection of her own very deep sense of personal and religious values.

I hope, for those who are concerned about this issue, that we will be able to respond, perhaps, in greater detail to those matters that I mentioned here. But I hope they will certainly give her, on this issue, the benefit of the doubt.

Mr. President, I withhold the remainder of my time.

Mr. NICKLES addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I will just make a couple of comments to conclude this colloquy on religious bigotry. I will enter a couple of additional statements into the RECORD.

But I want to clarify that, at least in this Senator's opinion, Dr. Elders did not apologize. She apologized for any offense taken, but she did not apologize for the remarks.

I might mention this. I will insert in the RECORD a letter from Father James

P. West. This letter is dated September 3, 1993. It shows the history of what happened back in January and February 1992.

I will just read this, and also show the history of what has happened in July, August, and September of this year.

In January and February 1992:

Father West confronts Dr. Elders on her remarks in order to obtain an apology from her.

Father West also confronts Governor Bill Clinton on this matter and asks for his assistance.

Dr. Elders offers no response to the appeal for apology.

Governor Clinton intervenes and sent Dr. Elders to Father West to make amends.

With possible insubordination to Governor Clinton, Dr. Elders offers an "apology" for "offense taken" to remarks, not an apology for the actual remarks, or a retraction.

I might mention, too, that I have already inserted in the RECORD a letter from Dr. Elders, on February 26, to Bishop McDonald, that says:

As discussed, in my statement which was quoted in the media, I did not have any pre-conceived malice or intent to blaspheme the Roman Catholic Church. I have the utmost respect for the Roman Catholic Church and its followers. If offense was taken at my use of the term "male-dominated" rather than "male-governed," please accept my sincere apology.

She apologized for using the term "male-dominated" when she should have said "male-governed." That was her only apology. She did not apologize for the entire remarks. That is in a letter to the Bishop. That is after meeting with Father West and after meeting with Governor Clinton, trying to resolve this matter.

Now, this year, in July:

Catholic hierarchy and organizations confront Dr. Elders on her remarks in order to obtain an apology from her.

Catholic hierarchy and organizations also confronted President Bill Clinton on this matter for his assistance.

Dr. Elders offers no response to the appeal for an apology.

President Clinton intervenes and has Dr. Elders make a statement concerning her bigoted remarks.

With possible insubordination to President Clinton, Dr. Elders offers an "apology" for "offense taken" to remarks, not an apology for the actual remarks, or a retraction.

She did not retract the remarks. She did not apologize for the remarks. She apologized if offense was taken. There is a big difference, and I think people need to be aware of that.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD this letter from Father West, and also a different letter from John Cardinal O'Connor to Father West.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. BONIFACE CHURCH,
Bigelow, AR, September 3, 1993.

DEAR SENATOR NICKLES: I write this letter in response to the so-called "apology" which

has now been given to the Catholic Church by Dr. Joycelyn Elders for offensive, anti-Catholic remarks she has made. The purpose of this letter is to inform you of a disturbing pattern which has now emerged in this regard.

Let us look at the historical record and find the similarities:

January 18, 1992: Dr. Elders makes her remarks in address to the Arkansas Coalition for Choice.

Jan./Feb., 1992:

1. Fr. West confronts Dr. Elders on her remarks to obtain an apology from her.

2. Fr. West also confronts Gov. Bill Clinton on this matter for his assistance.

3. Dr. Elders offers no response to the appeal for apology.

4. Gov. Clinton intervenes and sends Dr. Elders to Fr. West to make amends.

5. With possible insubordination to Gov. Clinton, Dr. Elders offers "apology" for "offense taken" to her remarks, not apology for the actual remarks or retraction.

July/Aug./Sept., 1993:

1. Catholic hierarchy & organizations confront Dr. Elders on her remarks to obtain an apology on her remarks to obtain an apology from her.

2. Catholic hierarchy & organizations also confront Pres. Bill Clinton on this matter for his assistance.

3. Dr. Elders offers no response to the appeal for apology.

4. Pres. Clinton intervenes and has Dr. Elders make a statement concerning her bigoted remarks.

5. With possible insubordination to Pres. Clinton, Dr. Elders offers "apology" for "offense taken" to her remarks, not apology for the actual remarks or retraction.

Senator, is this not an exact repeat of history? It seems as though there is great fanfare among some, now that Dr. Elders has offered her "apology" to the Catholic Church. However, what she is saying now is no different from what she told Bishop McDonald and me a year and a half ago.

It was only due to the fact that Dr. Elders' "apology" was insufficient so long ago that I felt no qualms about travelling to Washington, DC in July to inform the American public about this episode. Please inform the Senators and the American public that this has all been said and done before. Dr. Elders' repeat of last year's old and meaningless "apology" today cannot right a terrible wrong.

Sincerely in Christ,

FR. JAMES P. WEST.

CARDINAL'S OFFICE,

New York, NY, August 17, 1993.

DEAR FATHER WEST: Many thanks for your letter of 13 August, together with enclosures, regarding the nomination of Dr. Elders for the post of Surgeon General.

Your correspondence was on my desk upon my return from the 1993 World Youth Day Celebration with our Holy Father. I am anxious to review it.

Also, I enclose a copy of my recent column, printed in Catholic New York for your review.

Finally, I am grateful for your efforts to oppose Dr. Elders' nomination, as she has clearly exhibited her strong anti-Catholic beliefs. Her comments on the steps of the State Capitol truly make her unfit for high public office.

Know that I will remember you in my Masses and prayers. Please, pray for me as well.

With gratitude, best wishes and

Faithfully in Christ,

JOHN CARDINAL O'CONNOR,
Archbishop of New York.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I will just read this paragraph:

Finally, I am grateful for your efforts to oppose Dr. Elders' nomination, as she has clearly exhibited her strong anti-Catholic beliefs. Her comments on the steps of the State Capitol truly make her unfit for high public office.

Finally, in response to Senator KENNEDY's statement that, well, her remarks were really meant to be to the white, male-dominated Arkansas Legislature—and I am not sure who else—I will just read again this quote that I already inserted in the RECORD dealing with anti-Catholic bigotry.

*** and there the Church was silent when we talked about *** [unintelligible] *** the first 400 years black people had their freedom aborted, and the Church said nothing. The way of life for the Native American was aborted; the Church was silent. We attempted to eradicate a whole race of people through the Holocaust, and the Church was silent. *** Women had no right to vote for years. We ask why. Why do these things go on? *** [unintelligible] *** Any time when the right of choice is taken away from all of us and put into the hands of a few, these are the kinds of things that will happen, over and over again. Look at who's fighting the pro-choice movement: a celibate, male-dominated Church. [emphasis added]

The church was mentioned five times in this statement—a celibate, male-dominated church. That had to be referring to the Catholic Church. It did not mention the legislature. It did not mention any other organizations. It mentioned the church. So there was a very bigoted, anti-Catholic statement, which has not been retracted yet, which has not been apologized for yet, despite repeated efforts, including by Governor Clinton and President Clinton, to get a retraction and apology.

She apologized "if offense was taken." There is a big difference.

Mr. President, I believe we are under the order to break, so I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the Senator withhold the request?

Mr. NICKLES. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I know there has been some question about whether Dr. Elders apologized or did not apologize, but perhaps we are getting into semantics.

We put in the RECORD the actions she took long before, 10 or 12 months before, she was ever recommended for this position, and the words "apologize" and the references that were included.

Clearly, it is not satisfactory to Dr. West and to some Members here.

But I want to also get back to that, and the references, because I think it is important to understand the context in which any of these comments were made:

Look at who's fighting the pro-choice movement: a celibate, male-dominated

church, a male-dominated legislature, and a male-dominated medical profession.

That is the context in which this comment was referenced. From that time, in personal meetings with Father West she expressed her apologies, and in meetings with the bishop and Father West, she wrote an apology and has expressed those views in terms of the record of our committee. I indicated earlier in the discussions the additional steps that were taken.

As I say, I think it is important to look at any of these comments when we are suggesting that Dr. Elders has a bigoted bone in her body and to ask the question whether that particular kind of a comment that is made under those circumstances represents her fundamental integrity and the caliber and quality of her soul or whether her life's experience, which has been dedicated and committed to resisting bigotry in every form, shape, and manner, and a lifetime of commitment to the church of her belief is really the Joycelyn Elders that is before the Senate.

It is difficult for me to try to make a case which will suggest the former. It is clear to me that she is really a reflection of the tolerant and caring person who has been characterized by her life's experience.

I withhold the remainder of my time. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 12:30 having arrived—

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS UNTIL 2:15

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 12:30 having arrived, the Senate will stand in recess until the hour of 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:32 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m.; whereupon the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. GRAHAM).

NOMINATION OF M. JOYCELYN ELDERS, OF ARKANSAS, TO BE SURGEON GENERAL OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The Senate continued with the consideration of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is the nomination of Joycelyn Elders, to be Surgeon General.

Mr. GRASSLEY addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to

speak for 17 minutes as in morning business, on legislative business, and that the time not be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

REINVENTING GOVERNMENT INITIATIVE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today marks the unveiling of the President's national performance review, also referred to as the Reinventing Government Initiative. I want to congratulate President Clinton for following through on these reforms and for taking the first step towards fundamental changes in the size and behavior of Government. I also commend the fine work of Vice President GORE who spearheaded the effort and whose work exceeded the scope of many cynics.

For my party, I think we Republicans, in my view, should welcome and support the national performance review. But I say this on two conditions: First, that the administration view this as a bare minimum reform effort and also as very much a first step and, consequently, then be willing to do more; second, that the administration, with the help of many of us in Congress, go all out against special interests and those power brokers in Congress who are infatuated with the status quo.

These two conditions, it seems to me, will determine if the administration is serious about reform or whether or not this is merely window dressing. If the administration is serious, then Republicans are obliged to support the national performance review and even seek to expand its scope. What is more, should we fail to do this, it seems to me like we Republicans would risk ceding a critical function of our role as loyal opposition to Ross Perot. In my view, Republicans should be skeptical, but we should be very positive about this national performance review. Let me explain what I mean by that.

There are certainly reasons to be skeptical about this administration in general. First, reinventing Government is the agenda of the reform-minded not of a tax-and-spend Democrat. This administration's record, however, is that of an old Democrat, not of a new Democrat. Therefore, skepticism is justified for the moment. In other words, seeing is believing.

Second, this administration does not have a particular stellar record for keeping its promises. The recent budget battle is a prime example. Will the administration then really see these reforms all the way through?

Third, it does not have a stellar record for doing battle with Congress which, along with special interests, is public enemy No. 1 on this issue of governmental reform.

Will the administration risk offending powerful committee chairmen in its own party by pushing the reform agenda? Already, one such incident did occur in maritime reform, about which I will talk presently.

And fourth, to achieve successful reform, this administration would have to cause major changes within the institutions of their own constituencies—namely, Federal employee unions and domestic programs that this party, the majority party, has long supported.

There are reasons to be skeptical not just about this administration but also about this particular reform effort. Not the least of which reason is that so many previous efforts have failed. What makes this administration think it will accomplish what no other has accomplished since the turn of the century?

The last great endeavor—the Grace Commission—was top heavy with outsiders. This one is top heavy with insiders, perhaps some of whom were responsible for the President's much-ridiculed announcement in March that the war on waste could start by calling an 800 number.

I am afraid that this reform group may have gone to the opposite extreme. Does the public really believe that the bureaucracy will reform itself out of many of its own jobs? Will reform be dramatic enough and up to the challenge if the insiders are doing the reforming?

Without the right mix of outside and insiders, reform might be doomed to fail. There are few, if any, corporate turnaround experts on the NPR task force whose insights and inspiration for structural reform would be invaluable and indeed necessary for meaningful reform to take place.

Nonetheless, there is much reason for Republicans to be positive about the NPR. The overall direction is positive, and many of the reforms are overdue. If these reforms are understood as a first step—which they are—then this should be viewed as something to build on. I say that particularly for us Republicans to build on but to help the Democrats accomplish what they say they want to accomplish.

After all, reform of Government is Republican turf. Democrats have been the great defenders of Government. Their solutions have generally been to expand Government programs. But if it took Nixon to go to China, then perhaps it will take a Democrat to reform the Government—with bipartisan help. In this sense, it behooves Republicans to support this opportunity and then build upon it.

For these reasons, Mr. President, it is my view that Republicans should regard the NPR with a healthy skepticism yet with sufficient positivity as to seize the opportunity.

Those whose first reaction would be either negative or skeptical-but-negative should first consider the opportunity at hand, and then work to try to expand on the administration's efforts.

Mr. President, before I critique the specifics of the NPR, let me review some of the standards, principles, and expectations that were discussed over the past 6 months by myself, my colleagues and by the President and the Vice President.

First of all, it is important to understand that the NPR is a reform effort first, not a budget exercise. The resulting budget and deficit reductions are important but secondary. In this effort, the focus must be on the reform. Because, if we're not careful and we view this as a budget-cutting exercise first, but the structural deficiencies that brought them about will grow right back again as soon as we look away. We need to perform corrective surgery so that what we have now won't come back again.

The most relevant place to start when discussing standards for reinventing government is with President Clinton's own words. On March 3 in the White House Rose Garden, the President said the following:

Our goal is to make the entire Federal Government both less expensive and more efficient. *** We intend to redesign, to reinvent, to reinvigorate the entire National Government.

The President went on:

We'll challenge the basic assumptions of every program, asking does it work; does it provide quality service; does it encourage innovation and reward hard work? If the answer is no, or if there's a better way to do it or if there's something that the Federal Government is doing it should simply stop doing, we'll try to make the changes needed.

The key, here, is the President's intent to extend the scope of this effort to the entire Government—not just those parts that are covered in the first NPR. It would include reforming programs, restructuring them, downsizing them, or outright eliminating them. Everything but the Constitution should be on the table.

For Republicans, this should be good news. It is a deal we cannot refuse. There certainly has never been a shortage of good ideas on this side of the aisle for reforming the bureaucracy and making government more cost-effective. For starters, Republicans should do what it can to help inject some of the outside, corporate turnaround expertise that this NPR group lacks.

The specific programs contained in the NPR should be supported by Republicans. That is, of course, provided they comport with Republican principles and standards for achieving real reform, rather than cosmetic reform. And I would like now, Mr. President, to review what these Republican principles might be.

I have compiled what I believe are the basic, fundamental principles for reform of government as viewed on our side of the aisle. As there are 10 of them, I refer to these as "The Ten Commandments for Reinventing Government." I would like to outline these so-called commandments, and then contrast the NPR initiatives to them. This will give Republicans the means to evaluate the Vice President's work.

No. 1, all Government activities shall be on the table for possible reform.

No. 2, taxpayers shall get their money's worth.

No. 3, Government shall spend no more than it takes in.

No. 4, citizens shall participate in Government decisions.

No. 5, Government shall decentralize its decisionmaking.

No. 6, Government shall make greater use of competition.

No. 7, Government shall reform for effectiveness, not just efficiency.

No. 8, incentives shall be realigned to respond to performance goals.

No. 9, reforms shall be real and implementable.

No. 10, Congress shall not stand in the way of reform.

Take, for instance, commandment No. 7: "Government shall reform for effectiveness, not just efficiency." Let us now look at the proposed merger of the DEA into the FBI.

The proposed merger would certainly streamline the drug-fighting bureaucracy, and perhaps save money over the long term. In that sense, the reform brings about efficiency.

However, in the process, merging the DEA into the FBI means that fewer drug cases will be brought. This is because the DEA is geared toward bringing such cases to court. The FBI, meanwhile, is geared not toward bringing criminal cases but rather toward collecting intelligence. Drug cases may suffer the consequences. If so, this would hardly be an effective reform. Efficient, yes. Effective, no.

Let us take a look at another example. Take the fourth commandment: "Citizens shall participate in Government decisions." Let us then look at the proposed restructuring of the Nation's air traffic control system. This reform would create a Government-owned corporation, governed by a board that includes customers. Yes, this reform allows the citizenry to participate in decisionmaking; however, what is so intriguing about the Government owning the corporation? Have we not learned a lesson from Amtrak?

Third, let us take a look at the 10th commandment: "Congress shall not stand in the way of reform." In the case of maritime reform proposals put out by the NPR staff, Congress blatantly violated this commandment. Let me describe what happened.

The NPR staff put together a proposal to deregulate the maritime in-

dustry and put an end to wasteful and economically harmful subsidies and policies. This reform could have saved the taxpayers \$2.3 billion per year, and boosted the economy by \$8 to \$13 billion per year, according to some estimates. Yet when the proposal was leaked, the defenders of maritime largesse—in the form of powerful Members of Congress—circled the wagons to protect the special interests, and critical reform was averted. The proposal has been placed on the shelf, pending review by a special maritime commission. I intend to work with the Vice President in the weeks ahead to make sure maritime reform is considered and implemented by this commission.

Let me make a point of clarification, here. Many of us will disagree on which programs should be terminated and which should be defended. But it is another matter entirely when the process is interfered with. The NPR was a non-biased, neutral process whose focus was reform of government. The process should have been allowed to proceed without political obstruction. The merits should be discussed in an open forum.

In the case of maritime reform, this was not done. Nonetheless, as I stated, I intend to work with the Vice President to support his ongoing effort to review this program as objectively as possible.

Mr. President, these are meant to be constructive criticisms. These are the sorts of questions that I and my Republican colleagues must constantly pose as this debate moves ahead.

Let me make one final point.

One critical element in debating these issues thoroughly and in getting them enacted will be S. 101, a bill that will be before this body soon. This bill incorporates the ideas of the Senator from Delaware, Senator ROTH, that would set up a base closure-like commission to bring these reforms directly to the Senate floor. In my view, this is the single-most important action we can take to succeed in reforming the bureaucracy. Provided, that is, that we put back into the bill the authority to eliminate entire programs it desired. That authority was stripped from the bill as it emerged from the Governmental Affairs Committee.

In closing, Mr. President, I once again, congratulate the President and Vice President GORE for their important work toward reinventing government. I look forward to assisting their efforts, and I urge my Republican colleagues to muster up their competitive energies to help make this reform effort a success.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for yielding.

I rise in strong support of the nomination of Dr. Elders. I spoke on it briefly the other day. I would just add a few words.

First, she is controversial; no question about it. The President could have picked some physician no one of us ever heard of, who never said a thing on public policy, and it would have gone through like lightning. But she has spoken out, and she can reach and communicate with people where a great many others cannot.

Is she controversial? Yes.

Is Senator PRYOR of Arkansas controversial? Yes. Is Senator KENNEDY of Massachusetts controversial? Yes. Is Senator SPECTER of Pennsylvania controversial? Yes. Is Senator GRAHAM of Florida controversial? Yes. Is the Senator from Illinois controversial? Yes. You know we are controversial. That is part of public life. We are asking for someone who is a public servant to be a public servant, and we want someone who is willing to speak out.

That is what Dr. Koop did, and I think he did it very effectively for the American Nation. I think Dr. Elders will do the same.

The second issue that is somewhat sensitive is the charge that she has been anti-Catholic because, in a reference in a speech, she made a reference to a male-dominated church. She did not specifically say Roman Catholic, but the context suggests she was talking about the Roman Catholic Church.

I happen to be a Lutheran. My wife is Roman Catholic. Let us face it. Every religious denomination in this country—Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, Muslim, you name it—is male dominated today, with the possible exception of the Christian Scientists. But every other group I know is male dominated. It is part of our culture.

Now, maybe it was not diplomatic to say so, but that is the reality, and she talked about the reality. I do not think we should hold that against her or someone should suggest that she is bigoted because of that.

I think she will stand up and, in part, simply because of the controversy in our debate here, she will be listened to as many people will not be listened to. I think she will be an effective Surgeon General of the United States.

I do not know where we got the title Surgeon General. She is not going to be operating on anyone. She is not going to be performing any surgery. But she is going to be reaching out to young people, like the pages—we have new pages here, and we welcome you—like the pages who are here. And I think the pages and the young people are going to listen to her.

I heard Senator BUMPERS quote her in the Democratic caucus today. She

said: "We are teaching young people what to do on the front seat. We are not teaching them what to do in the back seat."

Now, maybe that is not as diplomatic as it ought to be, but she is talking facts, and that is what we need. We need that kind of leadership.

So I am going to vote for Dr. Elders. I believe that she is likely to do a superb job for this country. I hope the Senate does the responsible thing and approves the nomination.

I yield back any time that I may have to the Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the Senator for yielding.

I say to the Senator from Illinois, since he did not list me as being controversial, then I hope that my speech on behalf of Dr. Elders will not be viewed as controversial, but merely a very rational discussion of why she should be confirmed.

Mr. SIMON. Will my colleague yield?

Mrs. BOXER. Absolutely.

Mr. SIMON. I, of course, view the Senator from California as controversial. She is so diminutive, I did not even see her behind that podium back there.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the Senator for making that correction, because I think his point is very well taken.

I say to my friend from Illinois that when we do speak out clearly on these very tough issues, just by the very nature of the subject we are discussing we are being controversial. And certainly in the area of public health—preventing teen pregnancy, preventing teen suicide, preventing AIDS and other sexually transmitted diseases—we must not be afraid to be tough and controversial. We finally have someone, it seems to me, who is not afraid to stand up and tell it like it is, as painful as it may be.

Many times, Mr. President, the world is not the way we want it to be, or we would hope it would be, or we wish it would be. We must deal with it as it is presented to us, and sometimes these subjects are very difficult.

Mr. President, we have been discussing Dr. Elders now for days and days and hours and hours, both in committee and on the floor. We had, unfortunately, a month's recess, when this woman could have been serving us officially as Surgeon General. I could not help but think, I say to my friend from Massachusetts, Senator KENNEDY, who has worked so hard in her behalf, that we are losing time.

When I went home and I was with real people facing real problems, I wished that we had Joycelyn Elders in

place as Surgeon General, as a leader for our public health.

So we have lost precious time. And for what reason? We have lost precious time because there are those—and I give them their due and their right; they have done this because they think it is right. But there are those who wish to repeat over and over again the same things that we have heard—that Dr. Elders has made statements that could have been made in a nicer way.

Well, Mr. President, the problems are not nice, and Joycelyn Elders happens to be a nice woman, a good woman, a fine woman. But, yes, she has expressed herself in such a way that some people were offended.

I say she has nothing to apologize for, other than maybe some of the words she used. She has, in fact, made those apologies. But she does not have to apologize for her life, for her dedication to public service, for her service to her church. She describes herself as a church lady, and that means she has gone beyond just going to services on Sunday, but has actually gone out in the community to work to better the status of those who need help.

We have discussed Dr. Elders' qualifications; and what qualifications she brings. I have heard her described as the most qualified Surgeon General ever.

She graduated magna cum laude from the Philander Smith College in Little Rock. And after serving her country in the Army, she graduated from the University of Arkansas College of Medicine. After completing her residency, she earned her master of science degree and joined the faculty at the College of Medicine, where she rose to the rank of full professor.

In 1987, then-Governor Clinton named Dr. Elders director of the Arkansas Department of Health.

We have discussed her impressive record. I do not need to restate it. Senator KENNEDY has stated it over and over.

When she was in charge of public health in Arkansas, maternal visits for pregnant women increased by more than 26 percent; the Arkansas childhood immunization rate increased to 60 percent from 34 percent; the number of early childhood screenings increased tenfold; and HIV/AIDS education and prevention programs were greatly increased.

So we know the results of her leadership.

Mr. President, we have heard again the long list of public health organizations supporting Dr. Elders. Just to name a few: The American Medical Association, the American Nurses Association, the American College of Physicians, the American Pediatric Society, the National Association of Community Health Centers, the National Association of School Nurses, the Association of State and Territorial Health

Officials. These organizations, Mr. President, are out there with the people who need Dr. Elders.

The best thing we could have done would have been to have voted on her before the recess so she could have started in her work.

We have discussed her qualifications at length and the support that she has at length. But I want to concentrate in the remainder of my remarks on the three main reasons I find to support Dr. Elders. They are as follows: our children, our children, and our children.

We know that Dr. Elders has offended some Members of this body, and they have been very eloquent in their critique of her. They are offended by some of her words.

But, again, I must point out that we need to be at least as offended by the status of our children. And, Mr. President, I say to you if we are as offended by the status of our children as by some of the things she said, we would have voted to confirm Dr. Elders long ago.

I heard Senator MOSELEY-BRAUN put some of these facts into the RECORD. I am going to repeat them. And not only will I repeat them now, but I will be repeating them quite often as one of the two Senators from the largest State in the Union, California, where we face these problems.

Every 35 seconds an infant is born into poverty. Every 2 minutes an infant is born at low birth weight. Every 14 minutes an infant dies in the first year of life. Every 32 seconds a 15- to 19-year-old woman becomes pregnant. Every 64 seconds an infant is born to a teenage mother.

The clock is ticking. We need Dr. Elders to turn this around. Every 14 hours a child younger than 5 is murdered in America. Every 5 hours a 15- to 19-year-old is murdered in America.

So we can talk about the fact that this woman is plainspeaking and she tells it like it is. If she had been running for office she probably would have said it in a different way. We all learn to say things in different ways. But the real question is, what has she done in her life to address these problems? And I think the record is clear.

I would like to say that it is time to concentrate not on what Joycelyn Elders has said on occasion on a late-night television show or in a heated speech, but what she has done; not what she may have said off the cuff because she did not have a speech writer to iron out the wrinkles, but what are the problems facing America today and is she ready, willing, and able to reach out to our Nation's young people?

What a role model; a sharecropper's daughter, the only African-American pediatric endocrinologist in the country. What a success story.

Has she made a mistake in the way she expressed herself? Yes, probably a

time or two; probably a time or two. But if that is going to be the standard around here I do not think any of us could meet it, because every once in a while all of us have said something in a way we wished we had been able to rephrase.

So let us not waste any more time. The clock is ticking on these urgent problems. Let us get with it; let us vote; let us not take the full 8 hours. We are hearing the same things over and over and over again. It is getting to be a broken record. I defend every Senator's right to say anything he wants to or she wants to over and over, but to what end at this point? Let us vote. Let us change the status of our children. Let us give our children hope. Let us attack these problems in a direct way for the health of our children and our country.

I yield my time.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from California. How much time would the Senator from Arkansas desire?

Mr. PRYOR. I would like 6 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield the Senator 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LIEBERMAN). The Senator from Arkansas has the floor for up to 15 minutes.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I will not use that much time. I thank my friend from Massachusetts managing this nomination for yielding me the time to speak to this nomination of Dr. Joycelyn Elders, whom I hope will be confirmed in a short few hours as our next Surgeon General of the United States.

Mr. President, if we were only to examine Dr. Elders' credentials and her background, I think she would be considered a highly qualified individual for the post of Surgeon General of the United States. We all know the facts about her growing up in the three-room cabin, no electricity or indoor plumbing, in a rural farm community—southwest Arkansas. Yes, she was one of eight children. She worked in the fields from June to Thanksgiving to give support for her family.

She had those limitations but she never considered those to be limitations. She studied enough during her limited free time to skip two grades and graduate valedictorian of her school at the age of 15; then a scholarship to Philander Smith College in Little Rock. She finished her college program in 3 short years with a rating of magna cum laude and she joined the Army. On completion of her military obligation to the country she enrolled in the University of Arkansas College of Medicine, one of six African-Americans and the only woman in her class.

During her years of training she was subjected to many hardships related to segregation and racism, yet she never lost her vision. She never once lost sight of her goals. In 1964 she was

named chief resident at the University of Arkansas specializing in pediatrics. She received her master of science degree in biochemistry from the college of medicine, completed a fellowship in pediatric endocrinology, and joined the faculty at the college of medicine.

Dr. Elders became well known as a leading national researcher in pediatric endocrinology. She became an active member in many scientific and professional organizations. This is precisely why, I believe, so many of those organizations in which she worked, in which she labored, now endorse her candidacy to be our next Surgeon General of the United States.

In 1987 then Governor Clinton appointed Dr. Elders to head the Arkansas Department of Health. I must say that when she arrived on the scene she did not sneak into town. She made a lot of noise. She got our attention. She spoke with boldness. She spoke with frankness that we had not heard for a long time. She used this role to champion the needs of children and to increase the services available to all children from all walks of life.

She has held numerous leadership roles in health organizations and she is widely respected by her peers. These credentials alone, I might say, would highly recommend Dr. Elders for the post of Surgeon General. There is much more.

During Dr. Elders' tenure as head of the Arkansas Department of Health, she produced an unprecedented record of achievements related to public health issues. Following are just a few of those many accomplishments. Many of these points have been raised in this debate concerning the nomination process.

Mr. President, I take great pride in saying that, for example, in our home State of Arkansas the WIC program, Women, Infants and Children feeding program—during her tenure Arkansas was one of the first States to enter into an infant formula rebate program, saving some \$30 million in our State since 1988. While the Nation as a whole serves 50 percent of WIC-eligible clients, Arkansas serves 67 percent of its eligible citizens, up from 36 percent since 1989.

Health provider shortage areas: Dr. Elders, again, has won grants for innovative programs to attract health professionals to rural, underserved areas. She has attracted or helped to attract some 17 physicians and 5 other health care providers.

In the State scholarship fund, Dr. Elders was a leader in supporting and fighting for a program in our State under which some \$4.5 million has been given to financially needy high school graduates to encourage their further study. In student service centers, once again we find Dr. Elders at the forefront as a pioneer, as a champion of student health services, expanded from

1 in 1988 to 24 in 1992; 21 additional schools have approved establishment of these centers and are awaiting funding. But in all cases, local school boards decide whether to accept these centers and the types of the services that they will or will not provide.

Arkansas health statistics: Yes, there is a tremendous shortage, nationwide, of primary care physicians. In Arkansas, 34 percent of our physicians are primary care practitioners, while in the Nation generally that percentage is about 27.

Fewer children were born to younger women aged 15 to 19 years old in our State between 1990 and 1991, down from 6,999 to 6,873. We are making progress.

Also, between 1987 and 1991, during her tenure as head of the Public Health Service there, the abortion ratio for women in this age group declined from 32.1 to 25.3 percent.

I could go on and on. I will ask in a moment unanimous consent that these further statistics about her service, her tenure, her trusteeship in the Arkansas public health system, be made a part of the RECORD. But I will conclude simply by saying that Dr. Elders is so much more than her background. She is much more than her credentials, much more than her accomplishments. Dr. Joycelyn Elders is one of those very rare people who, rather than turning away from the cold, hard realities of some of our country's most troubling public health challenges, has dedicated her life, has dedicated her being, to battling these troubles and to speaking out and speaking out very boldly and frankly about them.

On a daily basis, when we are bombarded with newspaper and other media reports of the tragic consequences of poverty, poor education, and then loss of hope; we hear widespread reports of child abuse, guns in our schools, violence, premature deaths due to alcohol, drugs, teen pregnancies, births of drug-addicted and AIDS-infected infants, and the loss of family, community, and values to our society, most of us, I think, probably during this period go on overload; most of us stop reading; most of us are happier to turn away, to sweep these troubles under the carpet and pretend they do not exist because we are baffled; we are perplexed and mystified as to how to address these concerns.

But not Dr. Joycelyn Elders. She sees this gradual deterioration of our social fabric, and she is determined to do her part to eliminate those tremendous drains on human potential which threaten our Nation's future. She is also determined to awaken us to the realities of this country's problems and to shake us into awareness before it is too late.

Yes, it is certain that Dr. Elders has many diplomas and many degrees. She has the credentials for this choice and for this opportunity ahead. But there is

one diploma, Mr. President, that she does not have. She does not have a diploma from the school of diplomacy. She is not a diplomat. She tells it like it is. She has said things in such a way as to somehow shake us, to take us aback. But what she is really doing, I think, Mr. President, is trying to get our attention. She is trying to bring the attention of this society to these tremendous and troubling problems which we must no longer sweep under the rug and play like they do not exist.

I will say, Mr. President, that she truly is that one person who I think has come along at this particular moment in history who is the right person at the right time for the right job. I strongly recommend this fine individual. We go back a long time in my State. I have read of her; I have known her; I have watched her as she deals with life's experiences and life's problems in so many areas of our State. And now we hope that she has the opportunity, on a national basis, to expand her horizons, to look at this vision that she has for our country to address these problems, to shake us, to question us, and to challenge us to do better.

It is a great honor, Mr. President, today to be able to stand on the floor of the United States Senate and to recommend most strongly and without any reservation whatsoever Dr. Joycelyn Elders to become the next Surgeon General of the United States of America.

Mr. President, what time I have remaining I yield back to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I want to thank my good friend, the Senator from Arkansas, Senator PRYOR, as well as his colleague, Senator BUMPERS, for their eloquence and their statements of support on behalf of this nominee. This is not their first time speaking in favor of the nominee, both here in the United States Senate and also in visiting with Members of the Senate who have wanted additional information about this candidate.

I think all of us who have listened to them can certainly understand the value of this particular individual and this nominee, because both of these friends of Joycelyn Elders know her very well, know her family and, importantly, know the impact that she has had on their home State because of their own leadership positions in their State and because of the wealth of friends that they have and share in common.

Rarely do we have colleagues who can speak with such knowledge, such awareness, such familiarity in regard to a nominee. Many of us speak in favor of nominees who come from our

States and, on a number of occasions, some of us have the good fortune to know those nominees and can speak to the Senate about them. But to hear both of these friends and colleagues speak about this nominee in the way that they have and with the familiarity which they have I think ought to be very reassuring to Members of this body who may have been caught up with some of the comments or statements that have been portrayed as being really reflective of the values and positions of Joycelyn Elders.

Their statements and comments, I think, have been a real service. They have been enormously helpful. They certainly have been helpful to me in terms of our committee, and they should be with regard to the Senate.

I again thank Senator PRYOR for an excellent comment and statement. I am glad to yield—how much time does the Senator need?

Mr. SPECTER. Ten minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I note that the Republican leader is coming to the floor, and I am prepared to yield to him if he is interested in that, knowing his schedule. It may be even busier than mine.

I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for yielding me 10 minutes.

Mr. President, I support the nomination of Dr. Elders based upon her background and experience as the director of the Arkansas Department of Health, based upon the record that that department has made, based upon an interview that I had with her in some depth, and upon my genuine sense that the President's nominees ought to be accorded presumptions. Not that a nominee ought to be taken automatically, but this is not a lifetime appointment for the Supreme Court or Federal court but is an appointment for Surgeon General, a very important position.

I will make a comment or two on that subject, reflecting on the very bitter and divisive nomination proceeding on this floor relating to Senator Tower, which I think ought not to be repeated, and noting that there was bipartisan support; that is, support from both Republicans and Democrats in committee, including the ranking member, the senior Republican on the committee, Senator NANCY KASSEBAUM, of Kansas.

I note at the outset, Mr. President, that Dr. Elders has an extraordinary record, really an American success story. She came from a very small town. She was born into a family which did not have the amenities of life: No electricity, no indoor bathrooms. The population of her town in Arkansas was fewer than 100.

I think of the town I grew up in, Russell, KS, a town of 5,000 people. I was about to comment about my colleague,

Senator DOLE, who comes from the same small town, and how much more difficult it is in a community the size where Dr. Elders was born and raised. I think about some of the farms around Kansas where I worked as a teenager which had no indoor bathrooms. It is not the greatest place to work in the summer in the harvest field. Certainly, it is more difficult to grow up there.

She certainly has an outstanding record: Valedictorian of her high school class; subsequently graduating magna cum laude in 3 years from college and then used the GI bill to finance her medical education at the University of Arkansas College of Medicine where she was one of six African Americans and the only woman.

Then, in her professional career, she was on the faculty of the Arkansas College of Medicine, full professor, a well-known researcher in her field, and ultimately she became the director of the Arkansas Department of Health.

The statistics which I have seen and heard—I am always just a little bit concerned about statistics—but based on the information provided to me, an extraordinary record was achieved in the childhood immunization rates, with a marked increase from 34 percent in 1989 to 60 percent in 1992 among 2-year-olds. Also, achieved under Dr. Elders' leadership as Arkansas' Health Director was an increase in childhood health screenings, something in the range of 4,000 in 1988 to over 45,000 in 1992.

From all indications she had an extraordinary record as head of the Arkansas Department of Health.

I had a discussion with Dr. Elders and I found her to be dynamic, involved, and intelligent. I talked to her at some length about the problems that I see on the horizon of the American medical field as we struggle in this body with health care reform.

I have served as the ranking Republican on the Appropriations Subcommittee for Health and Human Services and have introduced legislation on health care, a subject which has been neglected too long by this body, a subject we should have taken up last year or the year before.

I discussed with Dr. Elders the issue of low-birthweight babies, a subject that I became concerned about back in 1984 when I found that Pittsburgh had among the highest infant mortality rate for African-American children. At that time, I introduced legislation on the subject. It is a human tragedy, and an enormous financial expense, more than \$150,000 in some cases, billions of dollars involved. I found that Dr. Elders had a total grasp of that subject, had worked in the field, and was prepared to do more.

I talked to her about the issues of terminal health care, where we find that in the last few days or few weeks of illness the expenses are enormous,

and the fact that we do not have a national power of attorney so that people can make a decision on what they choose for themselves. Here again, I found Dr. Elders to be a person with in-depth knowledge of a subject that I have worked on considerably.

On the subject of managed health care, again, she had a total grasp and an understanding of the subject.

I understand that there are some people who are concerned about some of her statements and some of her ideas. I would suggest that there are sufficient checks and balances on the Surgeon General of the United States so that no one is going to be able to come into that position and *carte blanche* do what she or he may please. There are laws and checks and balances that will see to it that Congress will have a role, others in the executive branch will have a role, the local school boards and other State health departments will have a role. It is not as dire a situation in my judgment as some have portrayed.

I think back to the confirmation proceedings on Dr. C. Everett Koop to be Surgeon General of the United States. I recollect that at that time, given his pro-life position, there were many on the opposite side of the political spectrum who opposed him, were wary of him, and were very concerned. Now you find the same thing in a sense with Dr. Elders who is pro-choice. Many on the other side of the political spectrum are concerned.

I had the privilege to introduce Dr. Everett Koop to the Subcommittee on Health and Human Services along with my colleague, Senator Heinz. And I think Dr. Koop became an extraordinary and outstanding Surgeon General and left a mark of the highest competence. And in so doing I think Dr. Koop allayed all of the fears that had been expressed about him when he undertook the job.

Only time will tell precisely what Dr. Elders will do if confirmed, and as I speak, and as we are on the Senate floor prepared to vote, it appears her confirmation is a virtual certainty, so that these words are not obviously going to be determinative. But I did want to say a few words about her and about the process, and about the field generally.

When the President of the United States makes an appointment in the nonjudicial context, it seems to me that there ought to be significant deference to that individual nominee unless there is some really strong reason for opposing the nomination. Historically the Senate has rejected relatively few.

I think back to 1989, to the confirmation proceedings involving Senator John Tower and I submit that the U.S. Senate was not at its best at that time. While we do express our own views, and I respect those who have spoken in op-

position to Dr. Elders, it seems to me that all factors considered, her background, her education, her professional experience, my own sense of her in the interview, the hearings which were held, the bipartisan support, Republican as well as Democratic, including the ranking member of the committee, that she warrants confirmation today.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, has leader time been reserved?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The Republican leader is recognized.

TRIBUTE TO MARK HATFIELD

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to one of our colleagues who made a little history during the August recess.

August 27 was the 9,726th day that MARK HATFIELD has served in the U.S. Senate.

And it was also the day when MARK HATFIELD became the longest serving U.S. Senator in Oregon history, breaking the record of the great Senator Charles McNary.

Senator HATFIELD's record of service to Oregon is truly remarkable.

Beginning with his election to the Oregon State House of Representatives 43 years ago this November, he has successively served 4 years in the Oregon State House of Representatives, 2 years in the Oregon State Senate, 2 years as Oregon Secretary of State, 8 years as Governor, and 26 years as U.S. Senator.

In all this time, MARK HATFIELD has never lost an election, never lost the trust and confidence of his constituents, and never lost the total respect and admiration of his colleagues in the Senate.

No matter whether you agree with him or not, everyone who has had the privilege of serving with him, knows that MARK HATFIELD is a man of integrity, and that his word is his bond.

Mr. President, Harry Truman once said that "If you want a friend in Washington, buy a dog." I suspect that every Member of this Chamber would join me in amending that statement, and in saying that "If you want a friend in Washington, get to know MARK HATFIELD."

I especially remember the friendship that Senator HATFIELD forged with our former colleague, John Stennis, when they served as the chairman and ranking member of the Appropriations Committee. And those of us here in 1973 recall that when Senator Stennis was shot by a burglar, it was Senator HATFIELD who rushed to the hospital and took command of a telephone switchboard that was overwhelmed with calls.

A former political science professor, Senator HATFIELD is nationally known

as a scholar of American Presidents—especially Herbert Hoover and Abraham Lincoln.

As some may know, Senator HATFIELD's conference room in his Washington office contains a very impressive display of Lincoln portraits and memorabilia.

It was Horace Greeley who once said that Lincoln made himself a leader "by dint of firm resolve, patient effort, and dogged perseverance."

The same can be said about MARK HATFIELD, and I know all Members of this body join me in saluting our friend and colleague on his record-breaking service to Oregon.

MIDDLE EAST: PROSPECTS FOR PEACE?

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, the Government of Israel and Palestinian leaders are only days away from finalizing a historic peace agreement. This settlement will not only usher in a new era of peace between Palestinians and Israelis, but could serve as the gateway to a broader peace in the Middle East.

Two years ago, when the Bush administration launched the effort to bring Israeli, Palestinian, Jordanian, Syrian, and Lebanese representatives together, the idea of peace in the Middle East sounded far-fetched and idealistic.

When the Clinton administration took office, it decided to continue the U.S. role as facilitator in negotiations among the parties in the Middle East. And, as we have learned in recent days, the Government of Norway also played a key facilitating role.

In retrospect, one can see that the Bush administration's initiative sparked a chain reaction which eventually made the unthinkable—peace between Israelis and Palestinians—thinkable.

But, it was not only thinking the unthinkable that has made the idea of a Mideast peace an achievable reality. It took courage—the courage of Israeli leaders and Palestinian leaders to break out of old patterns of behavior and to create the foundation for a genuine peace, starting with self-rule for the Palestinian people and mutual recognition.

It took insight, on the part of Israeli and Palestinian leaders, to recognize the benefits that peace can bring to their respective people. It also took real leadership to act decisively in order that the cycle of violence can be broken.

What will it take to establish the conditions for a broader peace in the Middle East? First, it will take genuine support for the Israeli-Palestinian pact from neighbor states and the other Arab States. The majority of Arab League states appear to support the deal. I am pleased that King Hussein backs the agreement and has commit-

ted Jordan to play an active role in working out critical issues, in particular the fate of hundreds of thousands of Palestinian refugees.

I am also encouraged by news reports that the gulf states have endorsed the agreement and hope that they will lend their financial support for the proposed emergency fund to help establish self-rule. While Lebanon's Prime Minister has criticized some aspects of the pact, he has clearly stated that his government will not obstruct the agreement. However, I am concerned about the news reports regarding President Assad's position on the Israeli-Palestinian accord. Syria's support for this agreement, as well as for continued negotiations toward a broader peace accord, is critical.

In the coming weeks and months it is essential that all of the parties in the Middle East commit to stay the course and that the United States continues its role in hosting and facilitating the negotiations.

Yes, there are those who oppose peace. The strongest opposition to this peace plan and a broader peace agreement will come from radicals and extremists on all sides. And, let us not forget terrorists—peace could put them out of business.

However, Mr. President, I believe that the majority of Israelis and Palestinians support the move toward peace. It will not be easy, especially at first, but only peace can bring true prosperity to Israelis, Palestinians, and the other nations in the Middle East.

EVENTS OF THE PAST FEW WEEKS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, contrary to what some may think, the world continues to spin while Congress is not in session, and I want to take a few minutes this morning to comment on some events of the past few weeks, and to look ahead to the upcoming congressional agenda.

Before I do, however, I also want to welcome my colleagues and President Clinton back to Washington. Yesterday's Washington Post quoted White House officials as saying that the President has returned from his vacation committed to moving his administration away from the left, and back toward the mainstream.

I join with my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle in hoping this report is true, and in inviting the President to join those of us who have been fighting for mainstream America.

We look forward to working with President Clinton on a number of issues of great importance to America and the world. But we also want to make it clear that we are not ready to discard the beliefs that have united us over the past months: Our belief in the American people, and in their ability to take risks, work hard, create jobs, and to achieve their dreams.

This belief—and not some partisan political urge to obstruct—was the glue that held Republicans together during this summer's budget debate.

Simply put, Mr. President, we believed then—and continue to believe now—that Government can not tax, spend, or mandate America into prosperity. In our view, growth, prosperity, and a vibrant economy can only be achieved by promoting and rewarding risk-taking, initiative, and hard work.

HEALTH CARE

The details of President Clinton's long-awaited health care reform plan have been leaking out these past weeks, and a full-scale announcement is scheduled for September 22.

I understand he could not do it Monday night because of football, and on Tuesday night there was "Roseanne," so they chose Wednesday night. I am not certain who gets bumped on Wednesday night.

I know I speak for all my Republican colleagues in saying that we are ready and willing to work with the President on a health care reform plan.

Our goal is to achieve a plan that will help strengthen our economy and make America more competitive. That means a plan that reduces costs and increases access. It does not mean a plan that reduces innovation and choice, and which increases taxes and mandates on small business.

I met with quite a few small businessmen and women during the recess, Mr. President, and no doubt about it—they're nervous.

Small businesses have been the engine that spurred America's growth in the 1980's—firms with fewer than 500 employees accounted for 10 million of the decade's 18.4 million new jobs.

That record of success and growth is now endangered. Endangered because President Clinton's budget bill has raised their taxes. And many are reacting the only way they can. By cutting costs. By not buying that piece of equipment. By not hiring that new worker, or opening that new office.

And now they're reading reports that the President's health care plan will involve a big increase in their payroll tax. And that will mean further cutbacks, fewer purchases, and fewer new jobs.

It has taken the President, Mrs. Clinton, and other administration officials 8 months to put their plan together. And I suspect that it might take Congress that long to analyze the plan, talk to the American people, and suggest improvements.

I believe that health care reform offers a unique opportunity for Government to prove to the American people that it can work. Let us not blow that opportunity by rushing through legislation that will put Americans out of work, or by dismissing those who might oppose the Clinton plan as nothing more than a special interest.

NAFTA

During the recess, Mr. President, I joined a number of my colleagues in meeting with President Salinas in Mexico City. I took the occasion to affirm with President Salinas my strong support of NAFTA, and my belief that it will create jobs and raise the standard of living in the United States, Mexico, and Canada.

That is a message I will be repeating in the coming weeks, and it is a message that President Clinton must repeat if he is to achieve passage of NAFTA.

Let me be blunt in saying that those of us who support NAFTA have a hard fight ahead of us. Many members of the President's party—including some of the House leadership—have pledged to do all they can to kill this most important trade agreement. They have also spent a great deal of time spreading a great deal of misinformation about NAFTA.

I said earlier, Mr. President, that the underlying belief of the Republican Party is a belief in the American people, and in their ability. That is not a belief shared by many who are opposing NAFTA.

These handwringers believe that America simply cannot compete on a level playing field. And by saying that NAFTA will result in businesses leaving America for Mexico, they are saying that they do not believe in the skills and productiveness of American workers, and they do not trust American business men and women to look at the national interest, as well as the bottom line.

Keep in mind that every time Mexico spends a dollar for imports, 70 cents of that dollar is spent in the United States of America. There are 700,000 jobs right now in America—jobs in America—creating consumer items that are exported to Mexico.

We need to get information out and educate the American people. Those on the opposite side have had weeks and weeks and months and months to paint a negative picture of NAFTA, and I am prepared, as my colleagues are, to work with the President.

REINVENTING GOVERNMENT

Given the controversy that will surround health care and NAFTA, no one would begrudge the Clinton administration advancing an idea guaranteed to win universal proposal. And no doubt about it, they might have found just such an idea in Vice President GORE's series of proposals aimed at reinventing government, because almost every American will tell you that government is too big and wastes too much money.

While I have not yet studied the Vice-President's plan in detail, I am concerned that instead of putting our bloated bureaucracy on a strict no-fat diet, it just suggests that it could do without a few snacks. And if the Presi-

dent and Vice President are interested in reducing the size and scope of government, then Republicans have some ideas for them.

Ideas like taking a hard look at what government should and shouldn't do—and eliminating some programs. I remember that every time President Reagan questioned the need for Amtrak or any number of other government programs, my friends on the other side of the aisle would respond with horror.

I also hope that any savings realized by the Vice President's proposals won't simply be used to fund new programs and bureaucracies which this administration has consistently advanced.

ADDITIONAL SPENDING CUTS

I am afraid, however, that funding new programs might be exactly what this administration has in mind.

We all remember that in order to convince enough wavering Democrats to vote for his budget, President Clinton had to promise that he would submit a package of spending cuts to be voted on this fall.

According to OMB Director Panetta, those additional cuts are being delayed until after Congress completes action on all of the regular appropriations bills—some time in mid-to-late October.

I hope that those who urged the President to cut spending this year recognize that this delay means that these cuts may no longer be dedicated to deficit reduction. Instead, as I said, they will probably become offsets for President Clinton's proposed spending increases.

I would just suggest that Republicans are not interested in proposing additional cuts so that Democrats can spend the money somewhere else. If President Clinton wants Republican support for this effort, he should allow us to use any budget savings to go to deficit reduction, or to offset the unfair retroactive tax increases on small business and the elderly which were contained in the budget bill.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS—BOSNIA/SOMALIA

Let me conclude, Mr. President, by sharing some deep concerns I have over the administration's policy toward two international hot spots—Somalia and Bosnia.

Last week, I sent President Clinton a letter outlining my belief that the weight of U.S. leadership is being brought to bear in an area where we do not have a national interest, and not being brought to bear in an area where we do have an interest.

While I strongly supported the humanitarian mission in Somalia, I do not see the need for America to continue a lead role in the missions of pursuing Somali warlords and of nation building. I believe it's time for America to disengage and turn over the reins to the United Nations and to Africa countries who have a clear stake in the stability of the area.

In contrast to Somalia, what is at stake in Bosnia is more than just Bosnia—it is the future of the international order. And one has to wonder how we can support nation building in Somalia, while, at the same time, we sit quietly by and watch the wholesale destruction of Bosnia and her people.

I am very disturbed with the Clinton administration's statements that the United States will accept any Bosnia settlement which is agreed to by all parties. This approach guarantees that the party with the greatest strength and the most territory will dictate the terms of the settlement. As the Bosnian Foreign Minister, Haris Silajdzic, said a few days ago, this is the rule of force, not the rule of law.

Let me add, Mr. President, that my hopes and prayers—and I know the hopes and prayers of all those in this Chamber—are with those who are seeking to achieve peace in the Middle East. No area has seen more tragedy, terrorism, and bloodshed in recent times, and no area is more needy of a true and lasting peace.

Mr. President, there is much on which President Clinton and I will agree in the coming months. And, there is probably much on which we will disagree. That is the nature of our democracy, which allows for competing ideas and competing philosophies.

Over the past year, I have been privileged to meet with delegations from many countries who are finally free after decades of rule by one philosophy. They come here not seeking money—rather, they come seeking inspiration and encouragement. They tell me that "We want to be like you. We want to be like America."

My job—and the job of all Americans—in the coming months is to ensure that America does not turn away from the principles that have brought, and can continue to bring growth, prosperity, and freedom to America and to all those who seek the American dream.

NOMINATION OF M. JOYCELYN ELDERS, OF ARKANSAS, TO BE SURGEON GENERAL OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The Senate continued with the consideration of the nomination.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I yield myself 20 minutes on the time controlled by Senator NICKLES in opposition to the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, like most Senators, I spent a good bit of time during the month of August traveling the length and breadth of my State. Many of the issues that my constituents spoke to me about were the same ones that the distinguished Republican leader just talked about.

The biggest issue while I was home clearly was the impact of the recently passed tax package. People are still concerned about what the impact would be, how would it affect them and the economy, and the economy in our State. Were there some good features in the package? More than anything else, I found that a lot of small businessmen and women are very worried about the impact on their businesses and what they can do to deal with it in terms of being subchapter S corporations. Should they switch to regular C corporations? They are worried about the retroactivity provisions, and they also worry about the possibility of additional mandated benefits being required from the employers? What would that do, and what further impact would that have? More than anything else, I found that my constituents were worried about the economy and the impact of the tax reconciliation package the Senate passed the night we went out of session.

A lot of them also asked about health care reform and what it is going to be like. Will it provide more or less health care? How much will it cost and who pays? There are a lot of concerns. Generally, they do not have a preconceived notion of what must or must not be done. They want to make sure it is fair and that they can afford it, and that some of the things that need to be done are done.

I think the jury is out on what we will need to do in terms of health care reform, at least in my State of Mississippi. People ask a lot about NAFTA. I think that the majority probably indicated they thought it was something we should do, but they had legitimate questions, questions that I am going to ask about the side agreements that have been reached now on that treaty affecting labor and environmental questions.

I will be seeking those answers and I will try to communicate that to my constituency.

In certain parts of the State people are very alarmed about the continuing increase in crime, drug-related crime, senseless crime where people are killed in drive-by shootings, even in Jackson, MS. It is not just in Washington, DC, or big cities of this country, it is all over America. And people want to know whether there is something more we can do to deal with crime and criminals in America.

That is a very legitimate question. And I hope that this body will soon get together—hopefully in a bipartisan way—on a reform of criminal laws and some changes that will help our people be able to deal with this very serious problem and help our local law enforcement people to be able to do their job.

Other than those four areas, the thing that surprised me the most was the number of questions I got about appointments to the new administration,

specifically about the nomination of Dr. Joycelyn Elders to be the Surgeon General.

All over the State, from one end to the other, people asked about that nomination and expressed their concern and their opposition to this nominee to be Surgeon General.

I want to emphasize, nothing that they said and nothing I say here today is intended in any way to diminish or take away from the outstanding record that has been achieved by this nominee. She certainly should be commended for the very humble beginning that she had in Arkansas. Many of us are familiar with that type of rise. In my State of Mississippi, a neighboring State, there are people who started out with poverty and nothing to show in terms of financial well-being but have gone on to get an education and do a good job in their profession. And certainly she has done that and should be commended for it.

But the question here is, should she be Surgeon General of the United States? And when I hear Senators stand and endorse her nomination, I have to listen to that. Senator PRYOR from Arkansas is certainly a respected Senator, and you pay careful attention when he makes his comments supporting her nomination.

But I think that this nomination will be a mistake. I think President Clinton will live to regret this nominee unless she makes substantial changes from her conduct of the past.

Here, today, I do not wish to repeat things that were said back in late July and August. They are a matter of record. And I do not want to go over things that perhaps have been said today. So I will not get into the details of my concern about the defective condoms that were distributed in Arkansas, the way they were distributed. I am not going to get into the debate back and forth about exactly what happened with the very anti-Catholic remarks Dr. Elders has made. Perhaps she has sufficiently explained that or apologized. But there are very strong feelings that she has shown at least insensitivity by her remarks.

I think that she responded as best she could and I think to the satisfaction of most Senators to the allegations regarding her taxes and bank problems. Perhaps they were problems, but I think she has answered to those and they are a matter of record and Senators can review them and make a decision based on that. I think probably she regrets the comments she has made about abortion lowering the number of Down's syndrome babies born. But I think they are very serious and have to be weighed. I will not get into those.

I once again want to ask my colleagues to review her record and listen to her comments. Her own words are what condemn her, not allegations. It is what she has said in a number of

areas that really cause me serious concern about her intent and her positions and her feelings and her combativeness in responding to people who disagree with her.

I want to read just a few passages—first I ask unanimous consent that a Washington Post article of February 16, 1993, entitled "Dr. Elder's Prescription for Battle: Outspoken and Upfront, Here's Clinton's Pick for Surgeon General," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 16, 1993]
DR. ELDERS' PRESCRIPTION FOR BATTLE; OUTSPOKEN AND UPFRONT, HERE'S CLINTON'S PICK FOR SURGEON GENERAL

(By Paul Hendrickson)

You might say she's got a sense of humor. On her desk at the Arkansas Health Department is an "Ozark Rubber Plant." Its stalks are sprouting curled condoms. They look so odd, these little yellow circles of latex sitting in a fake clay pot on the desk of the surgeon general-designate of the United States. There's a note attached: Blooms mostly at night. Blooms vary in length, depending on owner. Blooms may wilt in chilly atmosphere.

You might say she's folks. Not for her the opera or a highfalutin Little Rock dinner party. Joycelyn Elders will take varsity basketball games at Hall High every time. That's where her husband, Oliver Elders, is head coach. He's the winningest active high school coach in the state, and nobody in the state calls him Oliver Elders. They call him Coach. And enough people call her "Coach's wife," no matter that she's been director of the 2,600-person state health department for the past five years and is due in several months—pending her confirmation—to move north to the capital of craftiness, where she'll serve as a goad to the country's health conscience, a kind of burr under the saddle of our medical-cum-moral complacencies.

Which is basically what surgeons general do.

(On game nights, Coach's wife is the one in the stands at Hall High screaming at the referees when a close call goes the other way. "She's got a mouth on her, I'll tell you that" is the way Little Rockians invariably seem to describe Hall's number one fan. When TV reporters are hunting for the doctor, as they have been lately, they know where to take their cameras.)

You might say she's plain-spoken. She once described some of her antiabortion opponents on the Christian right as "very religious non-Christians." That got their hackles up, which seems to have been the idea. Here's something else she's said about various Arkansas antiabortion forces and Christian family groups who've tried to oppose her health agendas, especially those agendas having to do with the problem of pregnant teenagers: "Yeah, they love little babies, as long as they're in somebody else's uterus."

That's fairly mild, as hip-shooting Elderisms go. The doctor once called a conservative Christian foe "mean, ugly and evil." The fellow had tried to take her to court several times as a way of blocking her budget proposals before the state legislature. Her battles with the legislature itself are legendary in Arkansas.

Not the least of her hot-potato proposals during her five-year tenure has been the dispensing of contraceptives from school-based

clinics. According to Elders, no more than five high schools in the state currently have clinics that give out contraceptives to students, the chief reason being that the local school boards, which tend to be conservative, get to decide.

But the doctor keeps pushing.

"The best way to stop an abortion is to stop an unplanned pregnancy," she says.

"I've gotten to where I've turned rattle-snake, I zap 'em," she says of those who'd make her out as some vile polluter of the young. "People will stand up and tell me, 'But black people like to have their children young.' I tell them that's a lie. Black parents don't want their teenage children to have babies any more than white parents or any other parents do. I remember a white lady was going on at a meeting once. It was a couple years ago: 'I'm so good,' she said. 'I've given maternity clothes and a hamburger to these poor black teenage mothers.' I couldn't take it. I stood up and said, 'Madame, you can't out-black me, I've been black 57 years.' I said, 'Madame, I've never known a woman yet who needed an abortion who wasn't already pregnant. That's the problem you won't address.'"

She recounts this all bright-eyed and gravely voiced, as though spilling for a fight this minute. You ask if she thinks she'll enjoy her upcoming job. "There's no question I will enjoy, truly enjoy, being surgeon general with Bill Clinton. The surgeon general really does have a bully pulpit, you know, and I'll use it." Will she tone it down? "I never learned to tone it down."

Last month Bill Clinton's nominee informed the American Medical News (an official publication of the American Medical Association) that teenage mothers and their babies make up America's newest slave class. That got people's attention. She was quoted as saying, "If Medicaid does not pay for abortions, does not pay for family planning, but pays for prenatal care and delivery, that's saying: 'I'll pay for you to have another good, healthy slave, but I won't pay for you to use your brain and make choices for yourself.' * * * If you are poor and ignorant, you are a slave."

Like any Southern preacher, Joycelyn Elders talks in italics. And knows the secret of drumming the word that'll carry the song.

"I'm about what I'm about," she says. "I'm going to go up there being nobody but me."

A little shake of her head, delighted. It makes her perm bounce. Can't wait.

WHERE SHE COMES FROM

She's 59 years old. She's been a pediatric endocrinologist, studying diabetes and thyroid problems and growth disorders in children, for close to three decades. She takes her coffee black. She'll eat pizza and barbecue and collard greens and a lot of other things that aren't wonderful for your heart or waistline. She's published more than 150 research articles in scholarly journals. She's the mother of two grown sons. She tends to talk with her hands. She tends to recycle her best lines. She likes to dress in shades of red, especially when she's taking on the state legislature. There's a monster rock on one finger. She got married on Valentine's Day 1960.

Visitors to her home (it's out south of town, a huge, splendidous ranch-style place made of native stone and timbers) are apt to get a tour of the master bathroom. Don't laugh, it's an amazing bathroom—three or four people could get a bath in it at once. It's right off her and Coach's bedroom. "We can both come in here and have a fight, solve all our problems," she says, holding open the

door and standing aside. "I just love this bathroom, and so does Oliver. We've had some of our best talks in here. Fights too."

Out back is the barbecue pit. Previous occupant put it in. "You could put a whole cow in it," she says, still wide-eyed.

But what is she about?

She's an advocate of Norplant for welfare mothers who want it. She thinks "appropriate, age-based" sex education should begin as early as kindergarten. She wants even the poorest citizens in this country to have easy access to preventive health care and comprehensive health education. She supports a physician's right to prescribe marijuana for a patient. She urges an increasing use of nurse midwives and nurse practitioners, and not only in rural areas. But more than anything else, the incoming surgeon general—who of course must get past a Senate committee that includes Strom Thurmond and Orrin Hatch—wants to use her time in Washington to fight teenage pregnancy. In Arkansas the teen pregnancy rate is the second-highest in the nation, and the mere mention of this gives her pain.

"I'm not about abortions," she says. "I'm about preventing pregnancy. Which would in turn prevent abortions."

She'll say: "I don't love [another person] enough to make an abortion decision. * * * I feel that's a decision for a woman and her significant other and her God."

She'll say: "All I want is every child born in America to be a planned, wanted child."

Pressed under glass on the conference table in Joyce Elders's Little Rock office is a piece of paper with this on it: "Remember always to be grateful for the millions of people everywhere whose despicable habits make health education necessary."

She was the only woman in her 1960 graduating class at the University of Arkansas College of Medicine. She went away to frigid Minnesota for an internship and came home and eventually made chief resident. A black woman, in a Southern medical school, with nine white male residents under her.

Mr. LOTT. So the entire article is in the RECORD. I want to read a few paragraphs or sentences that sort of symbolize what causes me concern. It starts off by saying:

You might say she's got a sense of humor. On her desk at the Arkansas Health Department is an "Ozark Rubber Plant." Its stalks are sprouting curled condoms. They look so odd, these little yellow circles of latex sitting in a fake clay pot on the desk of the Surgeon General-designate of the United States. There's a note attached: Blooms mostly at night. Blooms vary in length, depending on owner. Blooms may wilt in chilly atmosphere.

Maybe that is humorous, but I really do not think it is too funny for a person that you are going to confirm to the highest medical position in the country. I think this is at least very inappropriate.

Further down it says:

You might say she's plainspoken.

You can say that again.

She once described some of her anti-abortion opponents on the Christian right as "very religious non-Christians." That got their hackles up, which seems to have been the idea. Here's something else she's said about various Arkansas antiabortion forces and Christian family groups who've tried to oppose her health agenda, especially that

agenda having to do with the problem of pregnant teenagers: "Yeah, they love little babies, as long as they're in somebody else's uterus."

Then further on over in the article, it says:

You ask if she thinks she'll enjoy her upcoming job. "There's no question I will enjoy, truly enjoy, being Surgeon General with Bill Clinton. The Surgeon General really does have a bully pulpit, you know, and I'll use it." Will she tone it down? "I never learned to tone it down."

I was talking to one of her supporters today and they were saying, well, she will grow with the job and she has learned from these confirmation hearings. Maybe she needs to tone down her approach, they said. And clearly she does. And if she is confirmed I certainly hope she will. But in her own words she said she never had learned to tone it down.

One of the things in this article that was referred to earlier in the summer, in July, that I have to refer to again because of my great concern about what she was advocating here. It says:

She is advocate of Norplant for welfare mothers who want it. She thinks "appropriate, age-based" sex education should begin as early as kindergarten.

Two problems with that. First, advocating Norplant—the quote actually had to do with prostitutes. Norplant is a birth control device that is inserted in the arm. What about the exposure to AIDS and other disease? You give these people a false sense of protection, of safety, and yet they are exposed not only to pregnancy in these relationships, they are exposed to all kinds of terrible diseases. We should not be advocating the false hope of Norplant as the solution to some of the problems we have in this country.

And sex education as early as kindergarten: I really have to question that. Also, if you take a look at some of the material that she advocated to be taught in kindergarten, I think you would be very shocked.

So, these are the types of things—these are just some quotes from a Washington Post article, obviously a paper that supports her nomination.

Just a couple of other quotes or issues where she has indicated what her position would be.

Appearing on the "MacNeil/Lehrer News Hour," Dr. Elders asserted 60 percent of American children are "unplanned and unwanted." Sixty percent? I do not believe that. And what does she propose we do about it—condoms and abortions. I do not think this should be the principal position of the Surgeon General of the United States.

Here is what she has to say about the teenage pregnancy rate in her own State of Arkansas: "Poverty and ignorance and the Bible Belt mentality" are the reasons why Arkansas ranks as the second highest State in the Nation in teenage pregnancy. I believe some Arkansas folks do not think too much of that particular comment.

I could go on. We all know the situation with this nominee. It appears to me she will be confirmed. If she is, I wish her well. She may turn out to be a great Surgeon General and I hope she will be. But I have to vote my own conscience and my constituency's.

I have given the President of the United States the benefit of the doubt on 98 percent of his nominees. I have supported most of his nominees. I have even spoken for some of them, but there are a few where the balance is just too heavy the other way. And Dr. Elders is a classic example of whom we should not have in this very important position.

Let me begin to close with this quote, and this is a quote from Bill Jones who is past president of the Arkansas Medical Society, again in the Washington Post December 17, 1992. He says:

She, Dr. Joycelyn Elders, is a rabble rouser. She polarizes people pretty quickly.

Is this who we want in the position of Surgeon General? We need a healer in the position of Surgeon General, not someone who cannot control what they have to say and actually wind up polarizing the American people.

This nominee deserves a lot of recognition for what she has accomplished in life, but I think that her comments show divisiveness and insensitivity and intolerance and nonhealing. That is not the person we need in the position of Surgeon General. Therefore, I oppose this nomination and I urge my colleagues to review the record, look at her quotes, look at her record as a matter of fact even in Arkansas, and then make a decision of how to vote.

Mr. President, I yield the floor at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Kansas [Mrs. KASSEBAUM].

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes or as much time as I may need.

Mr. President, as Surgeon General of the United States, Dr. Elders will be the Nation's most recognized public health advocate.

Dr. Elders is a distinguished pediatrician and medical scholar with strong credentials for this position. Prior to serving as the Arkansas director of health, Dr. Elders served as an Army doctor and as a member of the faculty of the University of Arkansas Medical School.

There is no question that Dr. Elders is academically and professionally qualified to serve as the Surgeon General of the United States. Nevertheless, this is an extremely controversial nomination.

Several specific allegations regarding Dr. Elders' finances were thoroughly addressed in her confirmation hearing before the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources. I will speak to some of those allegations in a moment.

However, it seems to me that the real crux of the controversy is the set of issues Dr. Elders has chosen to emphasize during her career and the manner in which she has presented those issues. Having spent the August recess in Kansas, I can say that these are the concerns which were raised repeatedly about Dr. Elders.

Speaking for myself, I have been troubled from the beginning by the way in which Dr. Elders presents her views on issues such as abortion, condoms, and teenage pregnancy. The words she has chosen are not ones I would use. Moreover, I do not believe that any of us are particularly comfortable discussing these issues in committee or on the floor of the Senate.

Although the choice of words is often not as important as the underlying policy, the job of Surgeon General is one where delivery and choice of words are critical to the position's success.

Whatever doubts there may be about Dr. Elders as the messenger, there can be no doubt about the importance of her message. Teenage pregnancy is a serious and growing problem, and we face a grim future indeed if it is not addressed.

Dealing with this issue has proved to be a baffling and frustrating task. It is tragic that far too many parents have shirked their responsibility to guide and discipline their children. There simply is no satisfactory substitute for strong parenting in terms of instilling the values and the hope which inspires responsible behavior by young people.

The sad reality is that many young people do not or cannot rely on the support and guidance of their parents. Dr. Elders is faced with that reality.

She has attempted to deal with that reality by sending loud, clear, and—yes—flamboyant messages. However uncomfortable I or other Members of this body may be with her words, I believe she should be heard. She deserves the chance to try to reach young people who no one else seems to be able to reach.

In the final analysis, my decision to support Dr. Elders' nomination was based on the hope that she will be able to strike a chord with young people whom I could never dream of reaching.

In all the furor over the messenger, there are some important aspects of Dr. Elders' message that I believe should be emphasized.

First of all, Dr. Elders does support school-based health clinics—a position which is unpopular with many. What may have gotten lost, however, is the fact that Dr. Elders also believes that this is an issue to be decided at the local level—not the State and not the Federal Government. It is Dr. Elders' belief that it is the responsibility of local school boards to decide whether a school-based clinic should be established and what services that clinic should provide. That is the approach she took in Arkansas.

In addition, Dr. Elders supports the distribution of condoms at school-based clinics. At the same time, she recognizes that parents are ultimately responsible for their children. Her policy is that parents should decide if the clinic can provide their child with condoms or any other services.

With respect to abortion, Dr. Elders supports a woman's right to choose her reproductive options. As Dr. Elders noted in her testimony before the Labor Committee, she is "not about abortion," but she is about avoiding unwanted pregnancies.

I appreciated Dr. Elders' frank statements that the only sure way to avoid an unwanted pregnancy or a sexually transmitted disease is to abstain from sexual activity. She stresses that parents have an obligation to ensure that their children fully understand the risks of engaging in such activity.

In response to one of my questions, Dr. Elders noted:

I believe that abstinence *** is what I have taught my children. Every parent I know, I feel, supports and teaches abstinence. Every preacher I know supports and teaches abstinence. But we know that sometimes they are not abstinent. *** If you can't be abstinent, I want you to be responsible.

Before closing, I would like briefly to review some of the other issues raised with respect to Dr. Elders—as these matters were the subject of intense scrutiny by the committee and they have been raised again during floor debate of the nomination.

A great deal of attention has been given to the failure of Dr. Elders' husband to pay social security taxes for the woman who took care of her mother-in-law. A power-of-attorney was given to her husband to act on behalf of his mother.

Dr. Elders' husband should have opened a joint bank account with his mother, and he should have paid Social Security taxes on the woman who took care of his mother. He did not. Rather, he deposited his mother's Social Security check into a joint account he had with Dr. Elders. This joint account made Dr. Elders technically liable for her husband's failure to pay taxes on behalf of his mother. In short, Dr. Elders was liable primarily because her husband deposited his mother's checks into the wrong account.

Much has also been said about Dr. Elders' role as a director of a community bank cited for mismanagement by Federal bank regulators. Dr. Elders was reprimanded along with the other bank board directors for failing to supervise properly the bank's management. Senator KENNEDY and I had the FBI review the bank situation in detail. Dr. Elders did not engage in self-dealing or improper personal profit at the bank.

Some have suggested that there has been an inordinate delay with respect to Senate consideration of this nomination. To the contrary, I believe the

Senate has moved expeditiously—particularly considering the number of matters requiring investigation by the committee. It has been hinted that a 1-week postponement of the original hearing date was some type of blatant delaying tactic. That is not the case. The hearing was postponed by mutual agreement between Senator KENNEDY and me because additional time was needed to obtain documents pertinent to the nomination.

Moreover, Dr. Elders was formally nominated on July 1—shortly before the Senate adjourned for the Fourth of July recess. We will vote on her nomination today. Compared with the 11 months which intervened between Dr. Koop's nomination and his confirmation by the Senate, I do not believe the Elders nomination has taken an unreasonable period of time.

Dr. Elders is a hard worker who understands firsthand many of the public health challenges confronting our Nation. I will join those voting in favor of her nomination. I will do so in the hope that she can convey a message which will be heard by young people making critical decisions about their futures. I will also do so in the hope that this message will be framed in a way which builds consensus and that it will not be lost in controversy over the messenger.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I want to express appreciation to the Senator from Kansas for her comments on this nomination. I know that she has given this a great deal of consideration. As always, she has been enormously conscientious in attending the hearings and in the preparation for the hearings and asking penetrating questions. She has been enormously constructive and helpful to the committee in helping it reach its own judgments and decisions.

I know, listening to her today and at the time of her statement in support of Dr. Elders at the time of the committee's vote, that she has expressed today and had these concerns about Dr. Elders and has stated so eloquently this afternoon the strong belief that Dr. Elders, as a Surgeon General, will be able to speak and talk to many Americans about issues involving health and health-related issues that perhaps would not be as responsive to the admonitions or comments or lectures or statements or speeches of other Americans.

And I think that is very, very true. I think the extraordinary work that she has done in Arkansas in reaching out to communities which in a very real sense felt left out and left behind has been enormously impressive; and I think is one of the very compelling reasons, among others, of the acceptance of her and recommending her as the Surgeon General.

So I thank the Senator from Kansas for her comments and statements. And also, as always, for the way that she has worked with all of us on the committee in moving this process forward. This has been a nomination where individuals have had strong views and strong opinions, both those in favor and those who had reservations about it. But she, as always, has been enormously cooperative with the majority, and with me personally. We are very grateful to her for all the good work she has done on this nomination and others. I thank her for her comments.

I see the Senator from Arkansas on the floor, Senator BUMPERS, who has spoken to this nominee both here on the floor and also to a number of our colleagues during the course of the consideration of the nomination. As I mentioned earlier, the Senator has the advantage of observing, in very close proximity, the work of Joycelyn Elders, working with her associates, her allies, her friends, and has a very keen awareness of what her leadership in this very, very important health position can really mean for the American people. We are grateful to him for his comments, as well as Senator PRYOR's. As I mentioned earlier, rarely do we have an individual nominee who is known as well by two of our colleagues as Joycelyn Elders is known. So to hear their strong endorsement of her, particularly to those who may have some concerns or some reservations, ought to be enormously reassuring and would, I hope, end up in any of those giving Dr. Elders the benefit of the doubt.

I think we, as a country, will be well served by her leadership, and I am hopeful we will have a strong bipartisan vote this afternoon.

How much time remains to each side, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WOFFORD). The majority has 2 hours and 5 minutes, the minority has 2 hours and 47 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield such time as the Senator uses.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, let me first thank the distinguished manager for the magnificent way in which he has gone forward with this nomination. His tenacity and determination, getting this nomination to a vote on the Senate floor, has been truly remarkable. I admire all people, even those who disagree with me, when they show that kind of tenacity and concern about somebody like Joycelyn Elders—and others, for that matter.

I also want to say to my distinguished colleague from Kansas, I listened intently to her remarks and I thought she spoke very eloquently and very knowledgeably about this woman and what is involved here. I want to extend my personal thanks to her.

I do not have any real reason to come here and speak again. I spoke on the

floor once before. I spoke in the caucus today. But as a very good friend of Joycelyn Elders, I felt I would be remiss if I did not come and share with the U.S. Senators some of my own personal beliefs, based on personal observations, of this truly remarkable woman.

I speak, as I say, both as a personal friend and somebody who is deeply concerned about who the Surgeon General of the United States is going to be, though admittedly it is not a lawmaking position, it is not even a policy-making position. And, from that standpoint, I want to say that I do not number bigots among my personal friends. Those whom I consider to be bigots, or who discriminate, are acquaintances. They are not friends.

But I have known Joycelyn Elders on a very personal basis for a long time. I want to reassure every Member of the U.S. Senate with a personal guarantee: She does not have one bigoted bone in her body. Everybody in Arkansas from the now-President of the United States down to the lowest employee of the Arkansas Public Health Department will tell you that she has been one of the most aggressive and finest public-spirited public servants ever to serve in any capacity in our State.

In addition to that, she has a unique quality called smarts. She is a very intelligent woman. She is a compassionate woman.

I have to say this, and I do not intend for this to be all that pejorative. But the truth of the matter is, if she were a strong pro-life proponent, the opponents of her nomination would be here nominating her for sainthood, because her qualifications are just that.

Everybody in the Senate knows that Betty Bumpers and DALE BUMPERS have been as active, or more active, perhaps, in childhood immunization programs than any other single thing. When I was Governor, it was education, health care, the park system. But Betty always made immunization the number one on my priority list.

And, in 1973, she finally got everything put together in the State to immunize every child in that State; immunized 300,000 children one Saturday—300,000 children in one day. Not an adverse reaction. That was sheer luck.

But Betty told me, she said, you know, this is all fine for the cameras and for the evening news. It probably helped your political career. But the truth of the matter is this is nothing in the world but a dramatization of the problem and until we develop a system of tracking every child who is born in America until they have been fully immunized against all preventable childhood diseases, this program is going nowhere.

So 2 years ago Rosalynn Carter, the wife of our former President, called Betty one day. President Carter and I had been Governors together; Betty

and Rosalynn had developed a fine relationship together. Rosalynn called and said, "Betty, I heard you talk about this tracking system you want to put into place across the Nation to make sure all children are kept up with until they are fully immunized." She said, "I would like to get involved in that."

To shorten the story, Betty and Rosalynn raised some money. They have been crisscrossing the country now for 2 years. One of the first places they went, naturally, was to Little Rock, AR, to visit Dr. Elders who was head of the department of health there. And what do you think? Dr. Elders was already putting a tracking system in place with a grant from HHS—way ahead of Betty and Rosalynn—way ahead of everybody else. And the minute Bill Clinton as Governor of Arkansas began to talk about the shameless teenage pregnancy rate in the State of Arkansas, he found out Dr. Elders was already ahead of him; already putting programs in place to reduce—and hopefully someday eliminate—the teenage pregnancy rate in our State.

Despite what you hear to the contrary, the results have not been perfect in Arkansas. But when you consider what the results would have been if nothing happened, it is very impressive.

Mr. President, I told this little story once before when I spoke on the floor, and it is worth repeating. The best way in the world to get my children to walk out of the room is to talk about how poor we were when we were growing up during the Depression. They do not want to hear it. They do not know anything about poverty. The other thing that will drive them out of the room is to tell them about my experiences in the Marine Corps.

But it is true: I was a Depression child. My father made \$75 a month working in a hardware store, but we were pretty well off because everybody else in town was getting \$21 a month from the WPA, plus whatever cheese and dried beans they could get at the courthouse on Saturday. My father sent my sister to a little Presbyterian school at Clarksville, AR, when he was making \$75 a month. But the reason I tell you the story is because there was a little all black Methodist school in Arkansas called Philander Smith. Obviously, it was all black because back in those days blacks did not go to white schools of any kind, and the Methodist Church felt a strong obligation to educate African-Americans. And so that school was founded. I do not know the history of it. It is an old institution in our State.

Once a year, on Sunday morning, my father would give my brother, sister, and me a nickel each when we went to church. At the end of the service, the pastor would say: We will now take our offering for Philander Smith College. And we marched down the aisle to

kneel at the altar, leave our nickel on the altar, and go home absolutely certain we had educated some poor, helpless black child.

It seems so naive now, yet all the Methodist churches in Arkansas were doing the same thing. And they picked out an exceptional child whom the teachers in a little old community said had remarkable promise. Philander Smith College plucked Dr. Joycelyn Elders out of this little community when she was 15 years old and enrolled her on this scholarship program. Three years later, at the age of 18, she graduated magna cum laude.

The rest has been cataloged on this floor over and over again. The Senator from Massachusetts has made this case as eloquently and as precisely as it can be made. All I can do is elaborate a little bit on it from a personal standpoint.

So she went to medical school. She was so bright: Scholarships, student grants, student loans; and today, the only black pediatric endocrinologist in America.

I told a story in the caucus today that bears repeating: During the recess, one of the things I did was talk to a group of 24 youngsters—4 white, 20 black—who had been picked by school teachers across Arkansas as having exceptional mental prowess but not a dog's chance because of their home environment. This is the third year I have spoken to them. They are 12 to 14 years of age. A little girl, whom I later found out was 12 years old, a very pretty little girl, said, "Senator BUMPERS, what would you say to somebody like me who lives in a bad neighborhood and would like very much to get out of it?"

And I gave her an answer. I said, "Well, if you really want out, just keep wanting it badly enough, and you'll get out." Admittedly, a pretty lousy answer. I have thought about it several times since then, and I wish I had said something more comforting to her.

But here was Dr. Elders. Somebody said that to her. She made up her mind she was going to get out of it, and she did, through hard work and grit and determination, and she became one of the top physicians in America.

She says things bluntly. I wish at times like this she were not quite so blunt. But, I promise you that all these Senators who have been off on this August recess making speeches at various places, hear in townhall meetings: "Why don't you politicians tell it like it is? Why can't you say what you mean and mean what you say?" Or, as Senator Herman Talmadge used to say, "You have to throw the corn where the hogs can get to it." You have to say it so the least among us can understand what you are saying.

I just finished David McCollough's great book called, "Truman." It took me 6 months to wade through that, but

it was the best 6 months I ever spent. So after Joycelyn Elders referred to the Catholic Church as male dominated, she apologized repeatedly. She mentioned a male-dominated American Medical Association, and it would be hard to quarrel with that, would it not, when about 80 or 90 percent of the doctors in this country are male? Of course, it is male dominated.

And she says things like "We have to give up this romance with the fetus." Well, that is a very indiscreet way of saying we have to worry about the children who are born: How we are going to feed them, how we are going to educate them, how we are going to provide them health care, and how we are going to provide jobs for them when they get up to a certain age. Admittedly, a very blunt, and, to some, offensive, way to say something that is true. She did not mean to hurt the feelings of the pro-life people in this country on that issue. As I say, it was a blunt way to say it, but everybody knew exactly what she meant.

She said, "We are teaching our children what to do in the front seat of the car," talking about driver's education, "but we are not teaching them how to conduct themselves in the back seat." Some people said, "Isn't that a terrible thing for her to say?" Well, is that not the truth? Is that not the reason that the teenage pregnancy rate, unwed mother rate in this country is absolutely out the roof?

Maybe Dr. Elders should be given another hearing and say, "I thought about these things, and here is the way I wish I had said it." Maybe everybody would buy into it if she just put it in nice, diplomatic language.

Nobody is arguing with the truthfulness of what she has said. They are arguing with her indiscretion and lack of diplomacy in saying things that need to be said. Harry Truman, one of the five greatest Presidents of this country, did not know the meaning of diplomacy. But make no mistake about it, when he said it, everybody knew what he was talking about. He called Joe McCarthy what he was. He called a lot of other people what they were.

I remember that great story about him letting out an oath and somebody chastising him. Afterwards, his wife Bess said, "Leave him alone. You don't know how long it took me to teach him to say 'manure.'"

Well, I listened to the Senator from Missouri this morning. I am very pleased that he concluded he would vote for Dr. Elders, but he called her "very unimpressive." Obviously, his entire career has been quite different from mine. I have visited with a lot of Presidents, kings, queens, and other dignitaries, and I have made decisions about who is impressive and who is not impressive in this world. Dr. Elders may have been a little bit awed being in a Senator's office—we forget how

that can happen. That reminds me of another nice thing about Betty Bumpers—she gives humility lessons at our house every night. She said, "You have forgotten what it is like to be a country lawyer in Charleston, AR, where nobody cared what you thought. People walk into your office, they have adrenalin pouring out of their hands because they are getting ready to tell something to a U.S. Senator, and it is very impressive to them."

Well, I did not fall off a turnip truck yesterday. I do not understand how anybody could describe a woman with such a remarkable career as unimpressive. Maybe she did not say something brilliant during the 20 minutes he spent with her. I find her to be one of the most impressive people I have ever known.

Mr. President, I do not remember whether I spoke on the nomination of the Surgeon General a few years ago—if I did, I spoke from this desk because this is where I have been virtually my entire career in the Senate. But I do remember that when President Reagan nominated Everett Koop to be Surgeon General, I read all the information I could find on him. I had been essentially a pro-choice Senator. I saw that Everett Koop had characterized amniocentesis as a search-and-destroy mission. I thought that was pretty heavy stuff. I did not like it. I think amniocentesis is one of the greatest things that has ever been developed in medical history. And because I took such strong umbrage and offense at that statement, I voted no. It was not a year until I regretted it because Everett Koop had said something that I am quite sure was not intended to offend this Senator or any other Senator. And I voted against him. Now we all know and history shows that I made a bad vote. He is one of the best Surgeon Generals the country ever had.

Somebody asked Joycelyn Elders: What are you going to do about these gangs that are taking over the streets of America? I did not hear her say this, but she is reputed to have said, "Nothing; they are lost. It is the next generation I am concerned about."

Nobody wants to believe that you ever give up on anybody. I take some exception to that, if that is in fact a true quote. I do not think you should ever give up on anybody. People of the Christian faith are never supposed to give up on anybody, anyway. But I know exactly what she is talking about. She is saying the money could be so much more productively spent on those we still have a chance to save.

So, Mr. President, I want to thank a lot of people on the other side of the aisle who are going to vote for Joycelyn Elders. I certainly want to thank all the Members on this side of the aisle who are going to vote for her, and I give my personal promise that not one of them will ever regret it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, on behalf of the manager on this side, I would like to yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the nomination of Dr. Joycelyn Elders, because I believe she is wrong for the country. Her supporters have presented what they see as her refreshing outspokenness; I see instead a clear and disturbing tendency toward bad judgment, hyperbole, and contempt for those who disagree with her.

We have already heard on this floor that she has stated or implied that this country's ills, including the scourges of slavery, Native American genocide, and the Holocaust, stem from passivity and indifference on the part of the Catholic church. She has charged Christian, predominantly Protestant, conservatives with having "slave master mentalities." She has suffered the censure of the legislature in her home State. As recently as today, we have seen an article in the paper by four current and past members of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, which states that her intolerant and irresponsible declarations disqualify her from serving in a national position of public trust.

Even were I not to disagree with some of Dr. Elders' public utterances, thinking them ill-judged, ill-timed, and poorly conceived, I believe that the way she has gone about implementing her policies has been flawed. I do not say that just because of ideological disagreement with Dr. Elders, but because her approach to health care simply has not worked, even in Arkansas. And I do not believe there is any reason to expect that it would work any more effectively for the Nation. Under Dr. Elders' leadership, Arkansas went from having the fourth highest teen birth rate in the country to the second highest. After declining from 1980 to 1985, the rate rose during Dr. Elders' tenure from 6.8 percent in 1987 to 7.8 percent in 1991.

Most significantly, the teen birth rate has risen in 10 of the 11 Arkansas counties where Dr. Elders succeeded in establishing school-based clinics, the centerpiece of her health programs. Overall, the teenage pregnancy rate in those 11 counties has risen by 12 percent.

According to the National Center for Population Options, a group that promotes school-based clinics, the Arkansas clinics had no measurable impact either on teen pregnancy rates or on incidences of sexually transmitted diseases. Under Dr. Elders' leadership, between 1989 and 1992, there was a 130-percent increase in syphilis cases among Arkansas teenagers and a 150-percent jump in teens infected with HIV.

I am not here to ask for more complete explanations of Dr. Elders' fi-

nances, nor will I discuss or raise the allegations of professional impropriety. I think the facts speak for themselves. Even aside from those troubling issues, Dr. Elders' professional record itself presents compelling reasons to oppose her confirmation.

The American Public Health Association in its report card found Arkansas to be the only State in the Nation whose performance was ranked in the bottom quartile—that is, as the "least health promoting"—in every category examined, including lifestyle behaviors that avert needless illness and injuries, and preventive community services. This is not the sort of performance that should be rewarded with a promotion. It is not good enough to blame the rise in teen pregnancy in Arkansas on poverty and ignorance and the Bible Belt mentality.

We should be aware that President Clinton plans to give Dr. Elders unprecedented power in her role as Surgeon General. Apparently, she will have direct control over health areas, including family planning, in which her predecessors were only advocates. By confirming Dr. Elders, the Senate would go beyond implicitly pardoning her hurtful and insensitive remarks. It would offer Dr. Elders a substantive opportunity to implement her ineffective family planning ideas. I believe we cannot entrust the public welfare on vital matters like teen pregnancy and AIDS prevention to someone with Dr. Elders' dubious record. America can—and must—do better.

I, therefore, will vote against her confirmation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, how much time is remaining on each side on this issue?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time controlled by Senator KASSEBAUM is 2 hours 43 minutes.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I would like to ask for 15 minutes of time from that time just stated.

Mr. President, we had a lengthy discussion on the issue before us, the nomination of Dr. Elders, just before the August recess. We are now rapidly moving to the time in which we will take a vote on this nominee. A number of things have been laid out for the RECORD—statements that Dr. Elders has made that have proven offensive to a number of us, her record as a public health officer for the State of Arkansas, and some of her testimony before the Labor and Human Resources Committee. I will try not to repeat a lot of what has already been said. But I thought it interesting today in reading a piece written for the Washington Times by Robert George. I would like to quote some from that, and I will soon have it printed in the RECORD.

Robert George is a member of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. He is

joined in writing this article by three former members of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, William Allen, Esther Buckley, and Robert Destro.

I think some of the statements made in this article are instructive to our debate. So I would like to cite from this article. Mr. George says:

Speaking as current and former Civil Rights Commissioners, our consciences will not allow us to remain silent on Dr. Elders' appointment. We believe that the nomination of someone guilty of deliberately making intolerant remarks against religion and displaying such indifference to the lives of Down's Syndrome children, especially to the Nation's highest position on national health care, is a severe setback to the cause of mutual respect for equal rights and for good will among Americans of all religious beliefs.

On October 23, 1991, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights forwarded a letter to then President Bush and to Members of Congress in which they stated the following:

Confronted with religious bigotry, the need for strong moral leadership is clear *** The Commission calls on elected officials to take all action within their power to eliminate religious discrimination and bigotry.

In fact, the charter of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights requires it to make recommendations against religious discrimination, and commissioners have repeatedly denounced religious bigotry.

The Commission has pointed out that the divisive political and spiritual effects of such bias threaten the very foundations of democracy.

It is on this framework and on this basis that Robert George wrote this article today entitled *Civil Rights Rationale Against Elders*. It is on the basis of the charter of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights and what commissioners believe is their moral obligation and their ethical obligation as commissioners to speak out and cite instances of what they consider evidence of religious bigotry and intolerance that then formed the basis for this article. They then go on to cite a number of instances in which Dr. Elders made statements that were deemed by these individuals to represent, at the very minimum, an intemperance in terms of her description of a number of individuals.

As we have heard,

Dr. Elders has repeatedly made public attacks on the religious beliefs of Catholics and other Christians. She has also demonstrated insensitivity to the rights of children with disabilities. Her intolerant and irresponsible statements disqualify her from serving in a national position of public trust.

During one of President Clinton's campaign addresses at the State Capitol in Arkansas, Dr. Elders was recorded as saying:

The first 400 years black people had their freedom aborted, and the church said nothing. The way of life for Native Americans was aborted; the church was silent. We attempted to eradicate a whole race of people through the Holocaust, and the church was

silent *** Look who's fighting the pro-choice movement: a celibate, male-dominated church.

Dr. Elders has spoken contemptuously of Christians who disagree with her. Some she accuses of having a Bible belt mentality, while others are "very religious non-Christians" with "slave-master mentalities." She has never denied making these bigoted remarks, nor has she withdrawn any of her charges.

The Senator from Arkansas said she repeatedly apologized for her remarks. What Dr. Elders did say was, "I am sorry if I offended some people because I did not mean to offend anybody." But she did not retract any of her remarks.

The Senator from Arkansas said Dr. Elders is refreshing because she tells it like it is and tells the truth, or what she perceives to be the truth. But in doing so, that truth, as Dr. Elders understands it, is not truth as the recipient understands it, and it is certainly offensive. And instead of retracting anything she has said, Dr. Elders simply wrote a letter indicating that she is sorry if it offended somebody. Under that standard, any American could stand up and say whatever they wanted to say and tell it like it is. If it is offensive, or if it is deemed intemperate, or deemed religious bigotry, under Dr. Elders' standard, the remedy is to simply say I am sorry if that offended you, but we have to tell it like it is, and if it hurts for you to hear it, well, that is just the way it goes.

The Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights has said Dr. Elders' remarks are either ignorant or malicious, and that it is a rank distortion of history to say that the Catholic Church was silent or did nothing about past instances of societal injustice.

Cardinal O'Connor, in a letter entered into the RECORD writes:

Such blatant and broad sweeping attacks as have been attributed to Dr. Elders would be troubling on the lips of any citizen. To hear them from one appointed to a national public office is even more profoundly disturbing.

James A. Smith of the Southern Baptist Convention's Christian Life Commission states:

I am deeply disturbed that Dr. Elders has demonstrated a pattern of attributing the worst possible motives to individuals and organizations who have consistently opposed her public policies on the basis of their faith.

Richard John Neuhaus, a recognized authority of issues of religion and government writes that the President should withdraw Dr. Elders' nomination because she,

has demonstrated a penchant for intolerance and ideological zealotry [that] can only exacerbate the social divisiveness attends our efforts to address difficult and controversial policies.

It is for that reason, Mr. President, that I rise today, because I so firmly believe that the position of Surgeon General ought to be one of consensus building. We have difficult public

health issues that we face in this country today, and we need a spokesperson who occupies the position of Surgeon General to help form a consensus as to how we, as a nation, ought to address those issues; someone who ought to be a coalition builder, someone who ought to inspire trust and confidence in the Nation's doctorate. Yet, we have a nominee before us who is someone that does just the opposite, that polarizes and divides, and causes respected individuals in America to make statements relative to her intolerance, insensitivity, and even charges of bigotry.

That is hardly the way in which I believe we ought to proceed in dealing with these important public health matters.

Mr. President, I want to bring another item before the Senate. I touched on this before the recess. But to me it displays a judgment which I think is not only disturbing but potentially very dangerous.

A few weeks ago, it was learned that as far back as 1990, the Arkansas Department of Health under the direction of Dr. Elders had distributed defective condoms in Arkansas school-based clinics and public health clinics. The condoms were purchased from a company named Ansell, Inc., which sold them under the brand name of Lifestyle. According to the Associated Press, over 1 million Lifestyle condoms were purchased by the Arkansas Health Department from Ansell, Inc.

On December 13, 1990, an official of the health department wrote to Ansell stating that a high school clinic had complained about breakage, but the Arkansas Health Department at that point continued purchasing condoms from the vendor and nothing additional happened until June 30, 1992, when in response to letters of complaint received by the health department on four other occasions, including a complaint by the Baxter County health unit on June 24, 1992, that three HIV antibody test clients had experienced condom breakage in every use from condoms that they received through the Arkansas Department of Public Health.

Finally, a month later, on July 24, 1992, Dr. Elders made the Food and Drug Administration aware of these complaints and drew some samples of the lots of condoms within the possession of the Arkansas Health Department.

Now we are talking about a significant period of time from the first report, and we are now into July 24, 1992, when the first report came through on December 13, 1990. Who knows how many tens or hundreds of thousands of condoms were distributed to teenagers and to others through the school clinics, or through other individuals, to Arkansas residents through the Public Health Service?

FDA then conducted an investigation, and in its investigation discovered a defective rate for these condoms 10 times higher than the limits set by the Food and Drug Administration. The Arkansas public was never informed of this problem.

On August 12, 1992, the FDA recommended an open-end seizure of all condoms bearing the Ansell label in possession of the Arkansas Department of Public Health, finding that the condoms should be seized under section 501(c) of the law in that their quality fell below that which they purport to possess.

The order for seizure was approved on August 27. No further action was taken until September 8, when the company voluntarily withdrew the condoms remaining in the possession of the clinics and the Public Health Department.

What we have here, Mr. President, is a situation where for nearly a 2-year period of time, condoms were distributed to young people in school. Those condoms were found to be defective. They were sent to the FDA and tested by the FDA and the FDA concluded they were 10 times above the minimum rate allowed by the Food and Drug Administration.

So following the orders of the FDA, now a year-and-a-half later, the Arkansas Department of Public Health, under the direction of Dr. Elders, with the compliance of the Ansell, Inc., the maker of the condoms, recalled those then left in possession of the clinics and replaced them with a new batch.

The question that arises is what about all those products that were distributed during that year-and-a-half period of time. What about those condoms in the possession of young people who were essentially told use these; it provides for safe sex, even knowing that the condoms in their possession were 10 times the defective rate allowed by Federal standards?

It seems to me that the minimal standard at that point, the minimal obligation at that point, the ethical obligation at that point, was to notify the public that if you are in possession of a Lifestyle condom distributed through your school or distributed through any of the Arkansas public health clinics do not use them, do not use them because they are defective, do not use them because, at the very minimum, you could become pregnant. Far worse, you could contract a sexually transmitted disease or even AIDS or HIV virus, which as we know, is in almost every instance terminal. We are not talking about a minor health matter. We are talking potentially about life and death decisions.

Faced with this decision, Dr. Elders made the determination that she would not notify the public, that she would not put out a public health announcement, a public service announcement, that she would not notify the school

clinics to notify those who potentially had picked up the condoms, that she would not allow a poster to be placed in the school saying if you have obtained one of these defective condoms or if you received one of these condoms do not use them; bring them in; we will replace them free; we will give you a new condom or batch of condoms furnished by the company because those that might be in your possession are defective.

Dr. Elders said, "Well, the reason I did not notify the public was that I am concerned about the public's confidence in condoms and for the greater public good."

Now, how in the world can that decision be for the greater public good? How in the world can any individual, knowing that a product that is defective and could cause death is in the possession of individuals, primarily young people, for the purpose of preventing unwanted pregnancy but can cause not only unwanted pregnancy but can cause a lifetime of serious transmittal of sexually transmitted diseases or even death through HIV virus, how can an individual say it is for the greater public good that I not notify them because I am afraid it will undermine the confidence in condoms?

I gave Dr. Elders an opportunity during our committee hearings to explain her decision, to at least say, well, if I could do it again I probably would have done it differently, or to say that is the advice that I had, that perhaps I did not give it enough reflection. So I asked her a series of questions during the committee hearings and I quote from that transcript.

Senator COATS. Do you still believe it was the right decision?

Dr. ELDERS. Yes, I do.

Senator COATS. Even knowing that potentially some young people using these could get AIDS and it could be a life and death decision?

Dr. ELDERS. We felt that really creating a major scare over a whole State would markedly reduce the—make everybody afraid of the condoms and not use the condoms of the health department. So that was the decision we made.

I was surprised if not shocked that she reaffirmed her position and her perceived correctness of this decision and stated that even in hindsight she still believes it was the right decision.

I then said:

Well, Dr. Elders as a mother you testified about your family and raising your children. As a mother would not you want to know if your children through distribution in school were in possession of condoms that were deemed by the Federal Government to be 10 times the defective rate of that allowed and potentially life threatening to your children? Would not you want to know? Would not you want to listen to a public service announcement, or get a recall notice in the mail, or have a piece of paper sent by the school saying if your children pick up the Lifestyle condoms from the public school health clinics during this period of time do not use them, retrieve them, bring them back; we

will give you new ones? Would not you want to advise your children of the potential danger facing you?

And she said:

Senator, what I would tell my children is different than what I would say as a public health officer.

Now, Mr. President, we are talking about a nominee who is going to be the spokesperson for public health issues for the entire United States. She is going to be speaking to the children of this country. She is going to be speaking to my children, children of every Member in this body, and children of 250 million Americans. But apparently Dr. Elders is going to use a different standard to speak to the children of America than she would use to speak to her own children. I find that profoundly disturbing. I find that profoundly disingenuous. That is either something that Dr. Elders was not able to comprehend or something that was in I think just simply blatantly poor judgment that could affect the health of many, many of our young people.

I trust that Dr. Elders if confirmed will rethink this process, will rethink the decision that she made, and in answer to a future question: Would you do the same thing all over again? She would say: Now that I better understand the risks, now that I better understand we are talking about life and death to our children, I certainly would make a different decision.

I find it ironic Mr. President, that virtually every week we seem to hear some announcement on the radio about recall of all kinds of different products. I doubt if there is anyone here who owns an automobile that has not had at least on more than one occasion gotten a notice in the mail from the automobile company saying we have got a defective such-and-such, and if you will take it into the dealer we will replace it for free.

We all remember the announcements. In fact, if you listen to the radio for a week, you are bound to hear that such-and-such a product sold in such-and-such a State is being recalled: "If you purchased it from the Giant or Safeway or People's Drug, or whatever, do not use it. Bring it in and we will replace it for free. If you are in possession of this, do not use it," whether it is bad tuna or a defective automobile part, or whatever. This is fairly routine.

It seems to me it is just a minimal standard that is applied across the board on all kinds of defective products.

In fact, in just the last week—I just did a little research on what is going on here. I have three pages full of recalls of products that have been ordered in just the past week.

One is a shoe cleaner. This shoe cleaner is being recalled, according to the Associated Press, because the reformulated version caused some irritation if used in confined places. In other

words, if you were in a close place where you were putting shoe polish on your shoes, it might cause some irritation—not death, not sexually transmitted disease, not the AIDS virus, but an irritation—and so it is being recalled.

Some butter is being recalled. Sixteen-ounce bowls of butter spread is being recalled because it may taste odd and might be susceptible to mold growth, and potentially the spread might cause flu-like symptoms.

So we have a product here that might cause flu-like symptoms, and it is being recalled. Public notice has been issued. But we have another product over here, issued by Dr. Elders in the Public Health Department of Arkansas, that is not being recalled, even though that product can cause death.

I do not understand the judgment that says if some shoe polish causes irritation, and some butter might have a bad odor or a bad taste and cause flu-like symptoms, that we should notify the public; but if we have a product over here that might cause unwanted pregnancy, as certified by FDA, at 10 times the rate over the minimum standard—it might cause unwanted pregnancy or someone to contract a sexually transmitted disease, or worse, someone to contract the HIV virus and die a few years later—no, we do not want to recall that because it might undermine public confidence in the use of condoms.

We recall butter. No one says we cannot recall the butter because people will say, "Well, my goodness people might stop using shoe polish or not buy the shoe polish, because people might stop polishing their shoes." It is the same line of reasoning, and I do not understand it.

Just a little bit ago, we recalled some mineral water because it had 2 times the 5 parts per billion level allowable under Food and Drug Administration standards. It was recalled to restore consumer confidence. So we have a defective product, minimally defective, and because the product maker understood that to let it go and not say anything might undermine public confidence, it was recalled to restore public confidence. Just the opposite of Dr. Elders' reasoning. She did not want to recall because she was afraid it would undermine public confidence.

So whether it is Tylenol or butter or shoe polish or car parts, or any of dozens of other products, notices are issued in the interest of public health and the interest of public safety. It is routine. It is done every day.

But if it is a condom that can give your child AIDS, if it is a condom that the FDA said is going to break because it is 10 times worse than the minimum standard, no, we do not recall that. If it is something that could kill your own children, we do not want to do that because it undermines public confidence.

Do you know, if Dr. Elders had said, "You know, Senator, I think if I could do it over again, I do not know. I was busy. I did not think about it. Maybe I made the wrong decision," or whatever. But instead, she says, "No, I would not do a thing differently."

"Knowing what you know, Dr. Elders—10 times as defective, could cause death—would you do it?" No. No, would not change her mind; would not do it any differently.

"What about for your own kids?"

"Oh, I use a different standard for my own kids. I am a public health officer, then I have to deal with the big picture. My kids? Oh, sure, I would like to know if it is my kids." But not your kids, not America's kids.

Now, I appreciate Dr. Elders' upbringing. I appreciate all that she has gone through. I appreciate the hard luck she has had. I appreciate the achievements that she has made.

But we are not talking about a hard-luck story. We are not talking about someone who has overcome. We are talking about someone who is going to be the spokesperson for public health issues in America. It is someone that needs to exercise discretion and judgment. It is not someone who needs to polarize and say offensive statements and cause people to have no confidence in the decisions of this individual.

We need someone who can inspire confidence, someone who can inspire trust. This is the Nation's doctor that we are talking about.

So I hope that Members will make careful determinations as to what we are voting for and the type of person we need and the experience and the judgment and the qualifications that the nominee brings to this position. I hope that in looking at the record, the record that has been documented very, very carefully, I hope they conclude that as fine a person as Dr. Elders is—I am making no judgment whatsoever about her family, about her personal life, about her personal qualities, about her remarkable achievements in lifting herself out of poverty—I hope we can separate from the debate an individual's achievements and focus on the merits, the substance of the issue at hand, the qualifications necessary to serve as Surgeon General of the United States of America.

I want somebody who will care as much about my children as she does about her own. I want someone who, when faced with a difficult problem, will exercise judgment in the best health and safety interests of the people of this country.

Mr. President, I probably said more than I should. There is a lot here to lay out in the RECORD. I have skipped a great deal, but I spoke at length on this before the recess and it is part of the RECORD.

I ask unanimous consent that the article appearing in today's Washington

Times entitled "Civil Rights Rationale Against Elders" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times, Sept. 7, 1993]

CIVIL RIGHTS RATIONALE AGAINST ELDERS

(By Robert George)

As individual present and former members of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, we believe the Senate should not confirm Dr. Joycelyn Elders as surgeon general and assistant secretary of health and human services for health policy.

Dr. Elders has repeatedly made public attacks on the religious beliefs of Catholics and other Christians. She has also demonstrated callous insensitivity to the rights of children with disabilities. Her intolerant and irresponsible statements disqualify her from serving in a national position of public trust.

Here is one example of her hostile remarks. In a Clinton campaign address last year at the State Capitol in Little Rock, Ark., she was recorded saying:

"The first 400 years black people had their freedom aborted, and the church said nothing. The way of life for the Native American was aborted; the church was silent. We attempted to eradicate a whole race of people through the Holocaust, and the church was silent. . . . Look who's fighting the pro-choice movement: a celibate, male-dominated church."

Dr. Elders has spoken contemptuously of Christians who disagree with her. Some she accuses of having a "Bible-belt mentality" while others are "very religious non-Christians" with "slave-master mentalities." She has never denied making these bigoted remarks nor has she withdrawn any of her charges. On the contrary, her recent letter to the Catholic bishops (sent just before the Senate confirmation vote, 19 months after she made her remarks) merely apologizes for causing "offense." She writes as if she does not understand why believers should be offended by her anti-Christian smears, thus compounding prejudice with ignorance.

The Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights has said Dr. Elders' remarks are either ignorant or malicious, and that it is "a rank distortion of history to say that the Catholic Church was 'silent' or did 'nothing' about past instances of societal injustice." Even the Washington Post agreed in an editorial that carefully avoided endorsing her nomination.

Some religious leaders have already raised their voices in protest. New York's Cardinal O'Connor, in a letter entered in the Congressional Record, wrote: "Such blatant and broad sweeping attacks as have been attributed to Dr. Elders would be troubling on the lips of any citizen. To hear them from one appointed to a national pulpit is even more profoundly disturbing." James A. Smith of the Southern Baptist Convention's Christian Life Commission reports that "Southern Baptists and other evangelicals in Arkansas have shared with me the disdain they have felt from Dr. Elders because of their opposition to her public policy agenda," adding, "I am deeply disturbed that Dr. Elders has demonstrated a pattern of attributing the worst possible motives to individuals and organizations who have consistently opposed her public policies on the basis of their faith." And Richard John Neuhaus, a recognized authority on issues of religion and government, writes that the president should withdraw

Dr. Elders' nomination because she "has a demonstrated penchant for intolerance and ideological zealotry [that] can only exacerbate the social divisiveness that attends our efforts to address difficult and controversial policies."

The charter of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights requires it to make recommendations against religious discrimination, and commissioners have repeatedly denounced religious bigotry. The commission has pointed out that the divisive political and spiritual effects of such bias threaten the very foundations of our democracy. For instance, in an Oct. 23, 1991, letter to President Bush and the members of Congress, the commission wrote:

"Confronted with religious bigotry, the need for strong moral leadership is clear.... [T]he Commission calls on elected officials to take all action within their power to eliminate religious discrimination and bigotry."

While Dr. Elders' support for unrestricted abortion may or may not reflect the Clinton administration's views, her defense of this position disregards the lives and rights of children with disabilities. In testimony to a congressional committee in 1990, she said "abortion has had an important and positive public health effect." Citing as an example "the number of Down's Syndrome infants in Washington state in 1976 [which] was 64 percent lower than it would have been without legal abortion." Abortion," she said on another occasion, "has reduced the number of children afflicted with severe defects."

Dr. Elders' ultimate solution to the problem of children with disabilities contradicts the Civil Rights Commission's 1989 report, "Medical Discrimination Against Children with Disabilities," which correctly described the denial of fundamental rights to children because of Down's Syndrome or other severe disabilities as unfair and discriminatory:

"A nation committed to the equal protection of the laws should; address the very real problems people with disabilities and their families face through fostering supportive services and social acceptance, and through defending the statutory rights of persons with disabilities.... To accept a projected negative quality of life for a child with a disability based on the difficulties society will cause the child, rather than tackling the difficulties themselves, is unacceptable. The Commission rejects the view that an acceptable answer to discrimination and prejudice is to assure the 'right to die,' to those against whom the discrimination and prejudice exists."

Speaking as current and former Civil Rights Commissioners, our consciences will not allow us to remain silent on Dr. Elders' appointment. We believe that the nomination of someone guilty of deliberately making intolerant remarks against religion and displaying such indifference to the levels of Down's Syndrome children, especially to the nation's highest position on national health care, is a severe setback to the cause of mutual respect for equal rights and for good will among Americans of all religious beliefs. People of all faiths as well as people who are disabled have an important stake in the outcome of this controversy.

We are confident that a large number of medical practitioners, women and men of all ethnic and racial backgrounds are both well qualified for this position and untainted by hate speech. A president and Senate concerned to overcome intolerance should find a tactful nominee whose record of sensitivity toward the civil rights of physically chal-

lenged children, of religious practice, and of free speech can set a better example rather than become a continuing source of national divisiveness and political embarrassment.

Mr. COATS. I yield back by time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, how much time would the Senator from Rhode Island need?

Mr. CHAFEE. Four minutes.

Mr. Kennedy. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, on March 5, here in the Senate, I spoke in favor of Dr. Joycelyn Elders' speedy confirmation as Surgeon General of the United States.

Today, I come back to the Senate to speak again for that same purpose. Following careful review of Dr. Elders' accomplished career as a physician, as a teacher, and as a director of the department of public health in Arkansas, I am persuaded that she has the experience and the determination and the forthrightness to handle this difficult and increasingly important job.

I view the position of Surgeon General to be sort of chief advocate for the public health of the Nation and all of us—many, at least—look back on Dr. Everett Koop as being the model who so effectively championed the role of chief advocate for public health.

Given the burgeoning public health problems our country faces today: Teenage pregnancy, the scourge of AIDS and other sexually transmitted diseases, the problems with substance abuse, the unique problems of the elderly—our Surgeon General must have more than the requisite medical and professional credentials.

Yes, we want that individual to be a doctor. Yes, we want him or her to have some experience. But it seems to me that the individual must be a tireless advocate and a coalition builder, capable of speaking with candor and with credibility to the American people. And, in addition, that individual has to somehow have the forcefulness to rise above the political fray here in Washington to do what is necessary to protect public health. I believe Dr. Elders possesses all of these needed qualities.

While serving as director of public health in Arkansas, Dr. Elders successfully advanced a comprehensive agenda of public health protection. What were some of the things she did? It was really a remarkable achievement, I believe. She had an aggressive childhood immunization program that boosted the immunization rates among 2-year-olds from 34 to 60 percent; nearly doubled the number of youngsters who were properly immunized in Arkansas. She had an intensive campaign to increase early childhood health screening, certainly something we want for our Nation. She did it in Arkansas, covering more than 45,000 youngsters by 1992.

She expanded the cancer detection services program for women, including mammograms and Pap smears for cervical cancer screening.

She had effective community health projects to promote smoking cessation, for example, and to promote healthy eating habits, and exercise to combat heart and lung disease.

Finally, she established a pioneering school-based clinic program where children, with parental consent, could receive screenings and other locally determined medical services.

In addition to all these she launched a highly effective campaign against teen pregnancy in Arkansas. And she did this with a local television station which won the George Peabody and Edward R. Murrow awards. These are the two top awards for public service stations. This effort has helped keep the Arkansas teen pregnancy rate down below the national average.

Dr. Elders has my respect for the job she has done in her home State, and I am confident she is going to bring the same kind of commitment to the job of Surgeon General of the United States.

Here on the floor of the Senate and in the committee we have examined every aspect of her career in what I might say is excruciating detail. All the issues have been raised and have been examined during this exhaustive confirmation process. And that is good. But now it seems to me it is time for us to vote, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes," and to give Dr. Elders the opportunity to assume this important position as soon as possible.

I thank the manager of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. MIKULSKI). The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

I want to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Mary Frances Berry, who is the Chairman of the Civil Rights Commission.

DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: It has come to my attention that one of my colleagues on the Civil Rights Commission and three former Commissioners have urged the Senate not to confirm Dr. Joycelyn Elders as Surgeon General and Assistant Health and Human Services Secretary because they believe she holds negative views towards some aspects of civil rights. I feel compelled in the interest of fairness to inform you that the Civil Rights Commission does not traditionally take a position on Presidential nominations. More importantly, the Commission has not at any time discussed or even considered the subject of Dr. Elders. Therefore, I assume that my colleague and the three former Commissioners are expressing their individual opinions.

Since my colleague and the former Commissioners have expressed their personal views concerning Dr. Elders, I feel obligated to share my opinion with you. I have not seen or heard anything in the public discussion of Dr. Elders that would lead me to believe that she would be anything other than a superb Surgeon General. I look forward to knowing of her confirmation.

I think that addresses the particular issue that was raised earlier.

Finally, Madam President, I will include again at this point in the RECORD this letter from the executive committee of the Association of State and Territorial Health Officials. We had the opportunity to debate before the recess the whole issue of condoms. But I just want to have printed in the RECORD this statement.

This is the executive board of public health officials for the entire country. I will include the full document but let me read some excerpts.

As State Health Officials and members of the governing committee for the Association of State and Territorial Health Officials, we believe that the Arkansas Department of Health met the criteria for sound public health practice in its response to complaints concerning breakage of condoms manufactured by Ansell.

I will just mention at this point, Madam President, those condoms were distributed in 27 States. Only one State took action to recall them, and that was Arkansas, under Dr. Elders.

Dr. Joycelyn Elders made the right public health decision to immediately notify the FDA, seize and replace all lots of the defective condoms in stock, and not publicly announce the discovery of a small number of defective condoms already distributed. Such a public announcement has the potential for critical negative repercussions including unfounded skepticism about the effectiveness of condoms, and thus decrease in rates of condom use.

Arkansas immediately and consistently took the proper course of action.

This letter is signed by two Republicans, six Democrats, and one independent.

I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in its entirety at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASSOCIATION OF STATE AND
TERRITORIAL HEALTH OFFICIALS,
Washington, DC, August 2, 1993.

Senator GEORGE MITCHELL,
176 Senate Russell Building, U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MITCHELL: As State Health Officials and members of the governing committee for the Association of State and Territorial Health Officials, we believe that the Arkansas Department of Health (ADH) met the criteria for sound public health practice in its response to complaints concerning breakage of condoms manufactured by Ansell. Dr. Joycelyn Elders made the right public health decision to immediately notify the FDA, seize and replace all lots of the defective condoms in stock, and not publicly announce the discovery of a small number of defective condoms already distributed. Such a public announcement has the potential for critical negative repercussions including unfounded skepticism about the effectiveness of condoms, and thus decrease in rates of condom use.

Arkansas immediately and consistently took the proper course of action. Between February and June of 1992, ADH received a total of four complaints concerning breakage of condoms manufactured by Ansell. Based on these complaints, ADH discontinued the

distribution of Ansell condoms on July 16, 1992 and ordered the recall of these condoms six days later. ADH simultaneously contacted five other states in the region and determined that there were no reported complaints concerning Ansell condoms.

The ADH then notified the federal Food & Drug Administration (FDA) of the defective condoms on July 24, 1992. Four of the six lots tested exceeded the FDA breakage standard of 4 per thousand. The FDA notified Ansell and began seizure proceedings in August 1992. On September 3, 1992 Ansell decided to voluntarily withdraw the defective condoms from the market. Sixty-eight customers were contacted in 28 states when Ansell undertook its recall. The ADH was the only customer in the United States that noticed the problem and complained to the FDA.

Public health decisions are exceedingly difficult because they must be based on the good of the community. Although it would have been a tragedy for one condom to break, it would have been a far greater tragedy to undermine public confidence in condoms, which would lead to reduced rates of usage and pose an even greater risk to the public health.

Sincerely,

Molly J. Coye, MD, MPH, President, Association of State and Territorial Health Officials. Director, California Department of Health Services; Charles Mahan, MD, President-Elect, Association of State and Territorial Health Officials. Florida State Health Officer; David Smith, MD, Commissioner, Texas Department of Health; John Lewin, MD, Director, Hawaii Department of Health; John R. Lumpkin, MD, Director, Illinois Department of Public Health; Susan Addiss, MPH, Director, Connecticut Department of Health; Michael Skeels, PhD, MPH, Director, Oregon Health Division; Mark B. Horton, MD, MSPH, Director, Oregon Department of Human Resources; Lloyd F. Novick, MD, MPH, Commissioner, New York State Health Department; George K. Degnon, CAE, Executive Vice-President.

Mr. KENNEDY. This letter was signed by virtually every member of the executive committee, the only member that did not sign was in Iowa dealing with health emergencies created by the floods. It may be disputed by some, but the principle, as the letter points out, is the concern that any announcement would have the repercussion that there would be significant reduction in the use of any condoms, and that would be a greater public health threat in terms of unwanted pregnancies, HIV, and sexually transmitted diseases.

That is the unanimous opinion of these principal leaders of the public health community.

I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY. I can understand others having a different opinion concerning an announcement about defective condoms. But I think if most of us try to compare this to shoe polish or Perrier water—I mean, it is a far reach. You can take a look at what happened to the consumption of grapes when just a few years ago, 4 or 5 years ago, we

found out that there may be contamination of grapes from Chile. It virtually dried up all utilization of grapes all over this country, even though only a small percentage were possibly tainted.

You could see what happened with the alar crisis on apples, in the late 1980's. Only about 20 percent of the apples were treated with the pesticide alar, but with the public announcement of that threat virtually all the purchase of apples dried up in this country.

It is those kinds of public policy issues that take extraordinary thought, a great deal of understanding, and study about human behavior. But to ridicule that kind of public policy decision, when it is virtually unanimously endorsed by other public health officials, I think is really a disservice in terms of the nominee.

We have debated this issue at length. As time is running on this debate, I am impressed by the fact that we are basically re-reviewing, re-repeating the debates prior to the break. We of course would hope that we could move as rapidly as possible to a judgment. But we respect our colleagues' rights to make any comments or to ask any questions.

I withhold the remainder of my time.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. DOMENICI. Does somebody control the time on our side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senator KASSEBAUM controls the time on the Senator's side.

Mr. DOMENICI. I did not hear the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senator KASSEBAUM controls the time.

Mr. DOMENICI. Has she yielded time to the Senator from New Mexico?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may make a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield myself 10 minutes under the time of Senator KASSEBAUM.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico may proceed.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, first of all, I think the record of this Senator is, in terms of nominees of Presidents of the United States—and I have been here almost 21 years—I adopt the principle and premise that Presidents are entitled to their nominees unless there is something very, very significant, in the opinion of this Senator, that denies that nominee the right to my vote or the privilege of having my vote.

In this case, I am going to vote against this nominee. I want to express my views very simply. I think I could go on for a long time, having read about some of her ideals, some of her views, and some of the things she has said. But I choose today to focus on just two issues.

First, in the time since President Clinton announced his selection of Dr. Elders as his nominee for Surgeon General, there has been a great deal of controversy among the general public, as well as among my colleagues in the Senate, about what is good health policy and the position of the Surgeon General. Unfortunately, the debate has not arisen out of a new-found interest in the position of Surgeon General. Instead, a number of policy statements of Dr. Elders in her previous capacity as director for Arkansas' Department of Health has fueled this discussion.

The result has been an analysis that we have witnessed over the past few weeks. She may, indeed, have accomplished a great deal. I have not studied that in enough depth to conclude, but many have, and I will not debate that issue. But the nomination of Dr. Elders is not just an issue of her medical qualifications, but of the whole person. It is clear that she has an impressive record in the health professional sense. In fact, there are very few arguments I have heard against her nomination that are based on her professional credentials. If this nomination were based solely on these credentials, then I am sure that she would be confirmed without hesitation. I believe, however, that since this is a bully-pulpit position and she states she intends to use it that we should examine all components of the nominee's qualifications; that judgment that her previous statements and positions indicate she has or does not have; that is, we should look at the whole person as we can judge it based upon what we know.

According to the Department of Health and Human Services, the Surgeon General serves as the public liaison for prevention and health information. In this capacity, the Surgeon General must be someone who is respected and recognized as a physician who will provide the Nation with the best scientific medical information on an issue, regardless of personal beliefs and opinions.

My concern regarding the nomination comes from the judgment exercised in a number of public statements that she has made while being employed as a public servant. I understand that in order to draw public attention to an issue, it is often necessary to make a dramatic statement. Unfortunately, a number of her statements were more than dramatic. They could be considered verbal attacks on groups or individuals who do not share her philosophy or position. I do not think that is what we need in a Surgeon General.

My colleagues have shared many of these statements with the Senate previously, and I must depart from my statement to give great credit to Senator DON NICKLES, of Oklahoma, who just 7 or 8 weeks ago started to inform us on many of the issues which are now

clear regarding the Surgeon General nominee. I do compliment the Senator for the work he has done.

So I am not going to take the Senate's time to go into all of those. Some were explained this morning by the Senator from Oklahoma, and other Senators on our side have explained them during the day. So I am going to move on just to those that distress me the most.

I have particular concern with Dr. Elders' remarks pertaining to the Catholic Church at a rally sponsored in Arkansas. It was the Arkansas Coalition for Choice, and it was January of 1992, not years ago, or months ago. She stated, and I quote:

*** the first 400 years, black people had their freedom aborted, and the church said nothing.

I am not going to comment until I finish the statements. There are four or five in a row. The first one:

*** the first 400 years, black people had their freedom aborted, and the church said nothing. The way of life of the Native American was aborted; the church was silent. We attempted to eradicate a whole race of people through the Holocaust, and the church was silent. Women had no right to vote for years—

Imagine this one. Excuse me; I should not put this one in because I am still reading the quote.

Women had no right to vote for years. We ask why. Any time when the right of choice is taken away from all of us and into the hands of a few, these are the kinds of things that will happen, over and over again. Look who is fighting the prochoice movement: A celibate, male-dominated church ***

Frankly, it is very infrequent that this Senator comes to the floor and speaks about his own faith. But as a Catholic, I find it troublesome that a public servant would make remarks that could be perceived to directly attack the Catholic Church, or any other religion. I have read her apologies to Bishop Keeler of the National Conference of Bishops, and I believe it is belated and long overdue. Whether it is sufficient or not, the RECORD already indicates what has been said. I do not think it is sufficient to merely say "I did not intend what you think," or "I am sorry for what I said," when you make statements like the one I just read.

However, it is the insensitivity and lack of judgment that initially led to these remarks for which I have great concern. In addition to being factually incorrect and historically inaccurate, these remarks show a lack of respect for the history of the Catholic Church and a contempt for its workings, and I seriously believe that is the only interpretation one can make of these remarks.

Dr. Elders has also made other statements that are inappropriate and show a great deal of insensitivity and poor judgment, but also have the potential to do great harm to the credibility of

the position of Surgeon General. As the Washington Post stated in its editorial regarding Dr. Elders' nomination, and I quote:

This Federal post can be used to spur a national response to critical health problems.

Continuing on:

It is not, however, a stage from which a Surgeon General is free to put off or trash segments of the American public with whom he or she disagrees.

I am afraid that Dr. Elders' comments indicate a strong tendency for this behavior. As public servants, we have the responsibility and obligation to know and understand that groups in our Nation have a right to advocate a variety of viewpoints surrounding contentious issues, and we must take that right seriously.

I also appreciate that Dr. Elders now understands remarks she has made have been perceived as insensitive. But as the Nation's leading public health official, she must have the judgment and foresight to recognize this prior to making the remarks.

We cannot judge the future unless we look at the past. I have stated a bit of the past for the last 6 or 7 minutes. I believe it indicates a certain kind of future on her part that is very apt to be insensitive to the feelings and beliefs of others.

I am concerned about the issue relating to the distribution of condoms. I have heard my friend from Indiana, Senator COATS, describe this in detail. I do not believe that I will go into it in detail. I do not believe I will go into detail on that other than to say that I believe there is a great deal of poor judgment involved in that decision.

This situation, in conjunction with Dr. Elders' many statements, shows a startling lack of sensitivity to citizens that Dr. Elders has sworn to serve. To me, this again becomes a matter of judgment. I have had many comparisons made. I have heard them between Dr. Elders and another Surgeon General, Dr. Koop, who is also known for his outspoken manner.

There was concern in the Senate that Dr. Koop's views would inhibit his effectiveness. As it turned out many of the fears of those opposed were unfounded. According to many, it would then tend to follow that Dr. Elders' nomination should be viewed with less skepticism. But many people here in the Senate and across the Nation disagree with Dr. Elders on ideological grounds. But that has not been the focus of this debate. Instead, our discussion has been, at least mine, confined almost exclusively to her judgment. While there appear to be many similarities in the debate regarding Dr. Koop and this nominee, I contend that my colleagues are mistaken. Dr. Koop was outspoken and, like Dr. Elders, had a different viewpoint than many in the Senate, but his judgment was not in question.

It is important to note that while I disagree with Dr. Elders ideologically, that will not be the primary reason for my voting against her confirmation. If she does not receive confirmation, I hope that President Clinton will nominate someone with less biases and better judgment but with the same medical qualifications. I believe that kind of person exists in these United States, and I believe we should seek that kind of person out. And then we would have qualifications in the medical sense—without poor judgment, and without bias.

The position of Surgeon General is designed to help educate the Nation and bring constructive and widespread attention to our critical national health issues. To that end, good and wise judgment is a critical qualification for any nominee.

I will vote against Dr. Elders because I do not feel nor am I confident that this qualification is adequately fulfilled.

Madam President, I choose today to stand on just two simple propositions. There seems to me to be a serious question of judgment, and clearly, clearly there seems to be some significant inaccuracy, lack of historical factualness, and perhaps even some contempt for the Catholic Church, which I believe has been a powerful force for good over time, not, as would be indicated here, responsible and blamed for almost every major social shortcoming in the last 400 or 500 years.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Madam President, let me first of all associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from New Mexico. He chose today an issue that I wish to expand upon, and that is the question of the judgment of this individual who is before us because we are about to vote on what I believe to be a decision of far-reaching effect on many of the health-related issues that will face the people of this country over the course of the next 4 years.

One thing that I would like my colleagues to keep in mind as they make this most important decision is: Does the United States need a Surgeon General that, while being vocal, is divisive and alienates groups in this country? Does the United States need someone in this most important position that will find common ground to unite folks instead?

Madam President, I would argue that the latter is, of course, the environment in the situation and the kind of person that we ought to be involved in searching out with this President to serve as the U.S. Surgeon General. I do not believe that Dr. Joycelyn Elders is that person. An individual can have

many fine qualities and clearly excellent experiences and yet not be qualified to serve as a public official.

Many colleagues have joined with me on the floor today to bring forth those very facts and have used example after example to clarify and expand on that very issue.

Many qualities that are fine in the eyes of most American citizens, certainly a vast array of experiences that few of us have had, and yet does this combination of quality and experience bring forth the kind of person that must be a leader in this country, that will be a responsible person on health issues and someone who has to have that ability to bring diverse groups together to work together to resolve these most important of issues?

While the nominee, Dr. Joycelyn Elders, has some of these qualities and many of these experiences, her alienation of a number of groups involved in health care issues clearly will prevent her—Madam President, let me repeat that. Her qualities will prevent her from being able to be an effective Surgeon General because many groups will walk away simply saying this individual does not have the tolerance and the capability to make wise decisions that might affect our particular group.

Let me make it clear. I do not agree with Dr. Elders on many of her positions. But I respect her position and the conviction with which she relates these positions. However, I feel that one can have strength and conviction without relying on the slandering of his or her opponents.

Dr. C. Everett Koop is a perfect example of someone who is an outspoken individual. But never once do I believe the record could record that he resorted to slander or to distortion to make his point. He dramatized it. He brought public attention to focus on issues that he thought were most important to the public health of this country. But he did not choose to call names, nor did he choose to rewrite history so that it would serve him and the point of view that he was trying to project.

Just a few moments ago, the Senator from New Mexico quoted a statement so made in 1992 by Dr. Joycelyn Elders that not only attempted to rewrite history as we know it, but clearly chose to put one group in this country against others in this country. And that should not be tolerated by this Senate of a public official that they have the right to put in office.

I am not denying that the average citizen has the right to say it. But I am suggesting that it would be terribly unwise of this Senate to confirm an individual who would choose to yield that as her position.

So what we are talking about is the platform, a very important platform, and the spokesperson of that platform. I do not find that it is acceptable for

her to single out the Catholic Church and imply that that religion is some sort of enemy in the area of health care, and that is exactly what she has implied. I find that not only inappropriate, I suggest that this Senate find it intolerable.

It is with those thoughts in mind and a variety of other comments that I will ask unanimous consent that I may have printed in the RECORD two letters.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 15, 1993.

HON. LARRY E. CRAIG,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR CRAIG: I urge a no vote on President Clinton's nominee for Surgeon General, Joycelyn Elders. She does not reflect the mainstream view of Americans; she is also abrasive, almost sounds bigoted, in some of her public pronouncements.

We do not need more division, polarization and discord. We need a reasonable, sincere consensus builder. Someone who will reflect good moral values and strive to find solutions within mainstream thinking.

Sincerely,

JULY 27, 1993.

HON. LARRY E. CRAIG,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR CRAIG: I would like to encourage you to make every effort possible to defeat the nomination of Dr. Elders for Surgeon General.

Dr. Elders' attitude and statements are totally bigoted, and are significantly inflammatory. We do not need an outspoken bigot, who is anti-Catholic, and wants abortion on demand at any time during the pregnancy. She is unhealthy for this Nation, and she is more unhealthy for the unborn children in our society.

I think that it is time to deal with the unwanted children in our society in a more constructive manner, and Dr. Elders has proven that she is not capable of leading this country in that direction.

Thank you for this consideration.

Most sincerely,

Mr. CRAIG. I have had an outpouring of phone calls and letters from citizens in my State whose opinions are alarmed by the very statements I have made as an accurate reflection of Dr. Elders' attitudes about different individuals in this community we call the United States. If she wants to destroy this community that must work together on these clear and vital public health issues, then she cannot use the platform of U.S. Surgeon General the way she chose to use the platforms that she has been allowed to elevate to by her experience and her talent.

I do not know what the Senate is going to do in the coming hour, but I suggest, if they choose to confirm this nomination, that Dr. Elders recognize that she has a much broader responsibility to this country than she has ever assumed before, and that she must lay aside many of her attitudes and the bigotry they have demonstrated.

I yield the remainder of my time.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I yield the Senator from New York 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. D'AMATO. Madam President, first of all, let me say that just before we broke for recess in August, Cardinal O'Connor wrote me a letter. I am going to read just part of it, because I think it is important. It called to my attention for the first time what I considered to be shocking and inappropriate and yet to be explained remarks of the nominee for Surgeon General. It was reported that these remarks were made during an address on January 18, 1992 at the Arkansas State Capitol in Little Rock.

Dr. Elders is quoted as saying:

The first 400 years black people had their freedom aborted, and the church said nothing. The way of life for Native Americans was aborted; the church was silent. We attempted to eradicate a whole race of people through the Holocaust, and the church was silent.

Madam President, these statements made by Dr. Elders are shocking. I believe they are anti-Catholic. Discrimination and bigotry in any form is wrong, and I am an Italian-American Catholic, and I know something about discrimination. It is ugly, it is intolerable, it is wrong, and it cannot be justified. Although Dr. Elders has issued a kind of apology—if you read her statement, it is "if I offended anyone." The very things she says—"a whole race of people" exterminated, and the church was silent. Is she saying that the millions and millions of Catholics are to be held responsible? Are we laying blame? What kind of divisiveness is this?

We know Dr. Elders made these statements and that she may regret having said them. What we do not know, and should know, is why she would make such statements. Why? This is going to be the chief spokesperson for the medical policies of this country. My doubts about this nominee are so strong and the questions that linger are so serious that I could not in good faith vote to confirm Dr. Elders.

Let me say that in the past weeks, literally tens of thousands of people have written, have called, have expressed their concerns about the qualifications of a person—Dr. Elders—who would resort to this inexplicable language in assailing a church, in assailing its people in a manner that is totally unjustified and uncalled for.

So I hope that we will vote against this nominee and that the President will come forth with someone who could more adequately represent this high and prestigious office.

Mr. WOFFORD. Madam President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Madam President, I may not need a full 10 minutes, but I did want to come

to the floor and speak strongly on behalf of Dr. Joycelyn Elders.

Madam President, in regard to this discussion that has been taking place on the floor of the Senate, I really do fear that some of it has been taken out of context. Madam President, I also fear that some of it has become a caricature of Dr. Elders, who, after all, a long time ago, long before this process, apologized for whatever remarks she felt were not well understood or that she might have regretted.

Madam President, I guess after having been in the Senate for 2½ years, one of the things that I am starting to worry about the most is the way in which there are attacks on individuals—and this is not the first attack on Dr. Elders, by any means. This is going to lead to a situation in our country where I think a lot of really good people are never going to go into public service. Maybe the right people will stay out, and maybe the wrong people will go in.

I have not had a chance to talk with Dr. Elders since the latest of these remarks that have been made on the floor of the Senate. But earlier, during the time when there were other kinds of attacks, I met with her. I will tell you something. I could really see the pain, and I could really see the hurt. I think sometimes those of us in public office, whether we are Democrats or Republicans, forget that all of us are fully human. I think maybe—maybe not tonight. My colleagues can speak for themselves, and what they say, I assume they say in good faith. But as I look at the overall pattern of what happened with this nomination and what she has had to go through—and I do not mean just tonight but before we went into recess—I really wonder whether or not we are not coming dangerously close to crossing the line. I think we have crossed the line, where people are going to have every single remark they made—some of those remarks they regret—part of those remarks taken out of context and under extreme attack over and over and over again.

I just simply think that it would be a real tragedy for our country, and for the Senate, if we did not tonight vote to confirm this outstanding woman.

Madam President, my wife, Sheila, and I had a chance to meet with Dr. Elders. The first time we met we were talking about some of our work dealing with a set of issues that I know you have been concerned about, dealing with domestic violence, violence against women and children. And Dr. Elders did not hesitate to engage in that conversation, to show her concern, and to lay out ideas.

I mean she will be the kind of person in a leadership position in our country who, I think, will invest her full heart and soul and intellect into making this a better country for all of us whether

we are African-American, black, white, or of another color.

Madam President, I remember during our committee the question was asked by a colleague, what kind of Senator, what kind of Senator—not what kind of Surgeon General—will Dr. Elders be? And I was thinking to myself what kind of a Surgeon General will she be? A woman from the humblest origins, overcoming grinding poverty, outstanding pediatrician. She will be a role model for so many young people in this country. It will be so important to have her as a Surgeon General, and I hope we do not miss that opportunity for our Nation.

What kind of Surgeon General will she be? I think she will be a Surgeon General that will not be afraid to challenge all of us, and who will speak to the concerns and circumstances of the lives of so many children in the United States of America that do not have, hardly any of us in public office, ever speaking to and with them, understanding them, and really helping them.

Some of my colleagues have suggested that she will be divisive. I think whatever you think about a particular remark that was made, whether you think it was a good or bad thing that that remark was made—and again Dr. Elders over and over again has apologized for that long before this process. I am not here to defend every remark made. I think we are talking about a woman, a real healing force for our Nation.

I guess my heart goes out to her when I hear the suggestion, or the implication, that she has some bigotry towards people of any religious faith. That must be very painful for her, because I do not think if you look at her overall record and look at her overall life and look at what she has done, you can really say that.

So, what kind of Surgeon General will she be? I think she will be the kind of Surgeon General that will unite us as a people and bring us together, black, and white, and Southeast Asian, and native American, and Hispanic.

Finally, Madam President, we are now at such a critical point in, if you will, the national conversation that we are having about health care. When I was at the Minnesota State Fair that issue came up over and over and over again. What kind of Surgeon General will she be? A Surgeon General that emphasizes primary care, family doctors, nurse practitioners, delivering care out in the communities. That has been her record in Arkansas, that will be her record as Surgeon General. She will serve our country ably, she will serve with distinction. She has that kind of record that we can all look at if we want to be fair, and I hope that tonight we will not make a mistake, but instead, we, as the U.S. Senate, will confirm her and that she will become Surgeon General because I know

she can make enormous contributions to our Nation.

I yield the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, I yield to the Senator from North Carolina how much time the Senator likes.

Mr. HELMS. I ask the Chair to notify me when I have used 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the distinguished Senator from North Carolina for 10 minutes.

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Chair.

Madam President, I have no intent to sermonize anybody about what the Constitution means when it specifies that the Senate shall give its advice and consent to nominations.

I do not want to moralize too much, but I think that we miss the boat if we do not give some thought to what I believe to be a truth about this country, and that truth is that unless the United States of America and the American people can get a handle on the moral precepts on which this Nation was founded, then we are headed down the slippery slope.

Now I have no personal animus for Dr. Joycelyn Elders, if that is the way you pronounce her name, never met the lady but I will say this: After 3 or 4 weeks in North Carolina and various other parts of the country, I have heard so many objections to President Clinton's nominee for U.S. Surgeon General that one hardly knows where to begin in describing them.

One thing that she has not been accused of is uttering one syllable on behalf of chastity or personal responsibility or restraint. She has wisecracked her way through her career and there may be some who think that is the way to do it but I must confess that I am not one of them.

Dr. Elders supports sex education for kindergarten children. She favors Federal funding of abortions. She favors free Norplant implants for prostitutes so that they can continue to sell their bodies in order to get money for drugs. She has preached condom usage to teenagers and she is silent in seven languages about abstinence.

We have the duty, each of us as a Senator, of passing judgment on every nominee that the President sends up here. I enjoyed what DALE BUMPERS said earlier this afternoon. DALE is a very eloquent Senator. But in this case I am obliged to say that he missed the point.

Perhaps most disturbing about Dr. Elders is that she favors destroying unborn babies as a method of preventing birth defects and infant mortality. But that is not all. As State health director in Arkansas, and I know that I am repeating what has been said before on this floor, but she time and time again ignored the law and in my judgment abused the power of her office. She

mocked those who oppose the deliberate destruction of the most innocent, most helpless humanity imaginable, the unborn children, by sneering that the proliferers should "get over their love affair with the fetus," and she even called them "non-Christians with slavemaster mentalities."

Well, in response it is fair to say that Dr. Elders should get over her love affair with the condom. She recently attacked the Catholic Church. I am a Baptist and the Catholic Church can take care of itself and has, but she railed, "Look who is fighting the pro-life movement. A celibate, male-dominated church. * * *" Not only did she display intolerance when she deliberately insulted the Catholic Church—she was way off base with her facts. Two of the most prominent pro-life groups in America—National Right to Life and the National Life League—are headed by women.

I think we should consider for a moment Joycelyn Elders' wrongheaded declaration that "Abortion has had an important, and positive, public health effect."

That is her opinion. It certainly has not had a good health effect for the children who have been destroyed.

According to her, abortion has reduced the number of children afflicted with severe defects. I do not know how she got her statistics. Maybe she does not know where her statistics came from.

She further said "The number of Down's syndrome infants in Washington State in 1976 was 64 percent lower than it would have been without legal abortion."

How she knows that, I do not know, but I do know that she realized that nobody can check up on her.

What she lacks is the mentality, I think, to understand that most, if not all, parents of handicapped children find these children to be blessings. I happen to know a little something about that personally.

Dr. Elders believes imperfect children are better off not being allowed to be born. By that statement, if implemented before she was born, maybe Dr. Elders would not be here today because Senator BUMPERS and others have constantly, repeatedly alluded to what a poverty-stricken family she came from during the depression.

So did I. So did I. But I do not go around waving the flag about it. As Admiral Nance, my good friend from Monroe, NC, said, "We did not even know we were poor."

She testified in 1990 before the Senate Labor Committee on the Freedom of Choice Act, and during her testimony she said "Abortion was the single most important factor in the significant decrease in neonatal mortality between 1964 and 1977." Again, where did she get the figures?

Nobody can challenge them. It is a given that this bizarre lady, as Surgeon

General, will try to force taxpayers to pay for abortions.

Mark my words. That is exactly what she is going to try to do, and I think the President will go along with it.

She said:

If Medicaid does not pay for abortions, does not pay for family planning, but pays for prenatal care and delivery, that's saying: I'll pay for you to have another good, healthy slave, * * *

What an inflammatory statement. And one of the defects in it is, it is not true. It is astounding that she did not know that Medicaid does pay for family planning. In fact, family planning has been a required Medicaid service for 20 years, and she did not know it. In 1992, Medicaid paid more than \$250 million for family planning and contraceptive services. Overall Federal spending for family planning in 1992 was an astronomical \$620 million.

Now if Senators or anybody else thinks her abortion views are kind of radical, they should take a look at her views on contraceptives. Consider her declaration during a summit on the National Commission on Children.

I do not know why I am chuckling. When I hear somebody with her presumed stature say things like this, I think: Where are we headed? This is what she said:

We have drivers' ed for our kids. We've taught them what to do in the front seat of the car, but not what to do in the back seat.

Boy, that is really statesmanlike. That is the kind of talk for which the Senate ought to fall all over itself in confirming a nominee who said things like that.

In an interview with "60 Minutes," Joycelyn Elders urged every young girl to put a condom in her purse before she goes out on a date. And as director of the Arkansas Department of Health, that is precisely what she did. And I say again that Dr. Elders should get over her love affair with the condom.

Dr. Elders established school-based clinics in at least 26 public schools, which sounds innocent enough. But the fact is that these clinics provide comprehensive and graphic sex education to children from kindergarten through the 12th grade. Their main focus is to distribute condoms and encourage their use.

Thanks to Joycelyn Elders, Arkansas public schools—not parents—now teach children what sexual behavior is acceptable. Rather than teach abstinence, self discipline, and responsibility, these clinics dispense condoms, birth control pills, and refer students for abortions without informing parents. And these clinics have been a colossal flop.

Joycelyn Elders' goal in pushing pro-condom programs in schools was to reduce teenage pregnancy, but the fact is that during her tenure as Arkansas Health Director, the rate of teenage pregnancies was 7.79 percent—a 10-year high.

In addition, the incidence of sexually transmitted diseases in teens dramatically increased. In 1989 syphilis in teenagers was up by 130 percent and HIV infection in teens escalated 160 percent.

These Arkansas statistics were perfectly predictable. A Louis Harris poll shows that teens who have had a sex education course that includes contraception instruction have a 50 percent higher sexual activity rate than those who have had sex education courses stressing abstinence.

Why have Elders' clinics failed to reduce teenage pregnancy? Could it be because the national condom failure rate among teenagers is almost 1 in 5? The fact is, records show that condoms are so ineffective in preventing pregnancy that the FDA has never licensed them to be advertised as contraceptives. So the bottom line is: Falsely teaching teenagers that condoms are safe and that it's OK to use them encourages young people to experiment with sex—thereby increasing teenage pregnancy and exposing them to AIDS and other sexual diseases.

While we're on the subject, Mr. President, consider the fact that as Director of Arkansas' Health Department, Joycelyn Elders knowingly distributed defective condoms. In 1990, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) found that condoms that her department bought for distribution at health clinics and schools had a failure rate more than 10 times higher than the FDA limit.

Did Joycelyn Elders re-call the defective condoms? You bet your life she didn't. Did she notify school children and the public not to use these leaky condoms? She knowingly and deliberately did not. So much for the welfare of school children. So much for this nominee's judgment and integrity.

Moreover, this matter would never have come to light if the news media had not exposed it. Dr. Elders' excuse: She claimed it was so difficult to get young men to use condoms in the first place that she "didn't want to make anybody afraid of condoms."

Mr. President, is this kind of judgment—letting children play Russian roulette with defective condoms—is this the kind of judgment we have a right to expect from the Nation's Surgeon General—the Nation's No. 1 doctor?

Dr. Elders' lack of judgment does not end there. On a recent CNBC program, "Talk Live," she was asked what she would do about crack-addicted prostitutes who give birth to crack babies. Her response:

I would hope that we would provide them Norplant, so they could still use sex if they must to buy their drugs.

What ever happened to treating the prostitute's addiction? Her response totally ignores an important reality: Norplant prevents pregnancies; it does nothing to prevent the transmittal of

AIDS. In fact, a recent AIDS study at the National Academy of Science found that the use of crack cocaine by women in New York City contributed greatly to the spread of AIDS.

Mr. President, Joycelyn Elders' radical ideas on abortion and teenage pregnancy are not her only shortcomings. She has also repeatedly ignored State and Federal laws and has shown poor judgment in her personal finances.

The Arkansas Constitution requires that the State do everything possible to protect the life of every unborn child from conception until birth. And the State Political Practice Act prohibits State employees from soliciting signatures on State grounds.

Despite these explicit State laws, Joycelyn Elders delivered a strident pro-abortion speech at a January 1992 rally at the Arkansas State Capitol Building. When challenged with violating the State constitution, Joycelyn Elders retorted that she has "no qualms about using her official position to promote abortions rights."

But Mr. President, in response to questions during her Senate confirmation hearing, Joycelyn Elders said she was not acting as Arkansas Health Director when she delivered the speech at the rally. I'd like to see a Senator try to get by with that phony excuse.

In direct defiance of the Political Practice Act, Elders appeared at this rally to solicit signatures to support the reproductive choice amendment. When asked about violating this law, she initially claimed she was there as a private citizen. She later changed her tune, saying she was "just doing her job as the health director." She had to change her tune so that she could use State funds to hire an attorney when she was sued for violating State law. Which of her statements was not a falsehood?

Did she appear at the rally as the director of the Arkansas Health Department in blatant violation of two State laws, or

Did she appear as a private citizen in which case she was not entitled to a State paid attorney?

There's another instance of Joycelyn Elders' indifference to the law. The Arkansas Democrat Gazette reported in July 1990 that Joycelyn Elders received a State salary of \$103,297 which exceeded the \$72,907 maximum State salary permitted by Arkansas law. For several years, it seems the Arkansas Health Department had transferred money to the University of Arkansas Medical School to supplement Elders' salary. The medical school then paid her a higher amount as a professor of pediatrics, even though her position as State health director is a full-time and a 52 weeks-a-year job.

The Arkansas Attorney General noted that, although her salary arrangement might not be illegal, it may have violated the spirit of the State

statutes setting maximum salaries. The attorney general characterized the pay arrangement as "questionable." Referring to Elders' contractual arrangement, the spokesman for the attorney general admitted, "We think there are reasons to believe that that contract would be void if it were presented to a court."

If this were not enough, Mr. President, in recent months Joycelyn Elders was paid by three different sources: First, the Arkansas Health Department; second the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services; and third the University of Arkansas Medical School. Arkansas taxpayers should know about this triple dipping, and Americans should know about it too.

And what about Joycelyn Elders' mismanagement and banking violations? In March 1992, the National Bank of Arkansas sued Joycelyn Elders and other members of the bank's board of directors for negligent mismanagement involving bad lending and investment practices. As a board member, Joycelyn Elders gave herself an unsecured \$230,000 line of credit, along with others.

And then, Mr. President, there is the likelihood that Joycelyn Elders may have a Zoe Baird problem. She and her husband failed to pay Social Security taxes for a nurse who cared for Mr. Elders' mother—who has Alzheimer's disease. Although the Elders got around to paying the \$15,000 in back taxes this summer, there still are questions as to why they were not paid when due.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. HELMS. Madam President, I shall conclude in just one moment. I ask unanimous consent that I may have an additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator will be allowed to proceed for 1 more minute.

Mr. HELMS. Madam President, what do I think about the nomination of Dr. Elders? What do I think of all the things she said?

At a minimum, I think there are serious questions about Joycelyn Elders' judgment.

Furthermore, she is pushing and shoving and demanding a public health philosophy that is anathema to many Americans, and a philosophy that failed miserably in Arkansas.

This Nation needs a Surgeon General who will uphold the law, not scoff at it. Americans deserve a Surgeon General who will espouse public health ideas that make sense, not encourage mothers to abort their babies just because they have a birth defect or because it would be inconvenient to have them.

So to me, as one Senator who is designated to cast a vote on this nomination under the Constitution, Joycelyn Elders, by her deeds and her words, does not deserve to be confirmed by the Senate to serve as Surgeon General of the United States.

Yes, I know she will be confirmed. But as a Senator, I cannot vote for her. I thank the Chair and I yield the floor.

Mr. NICKLES addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FEINGOLD). The Chair recognizes the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. I thank my friend and colleague from North Carolina for his statement.

Just for the notification of Senators, except for Senator EXON, I do not know of anyone else who wishes to speak on our side. I have some comments that will probably take about 15 or 20 minutes, and then I believe on this side we will be ready to vote.

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. NICKLES. I am happy to yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. I think we have one or two very brief comments, so I think our side will probably take less than half an hour. If it is agreeable with the Senator, I will communicate that to the majority leader and he can talk to the minority leader and perhaps set a time that is convenient to the leadership.

But I think we are looking at approximately 7 o'clock, unless there are other Members who want to speak at greater length.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. NICKLES. I thank the Senator.

I might inquire of the Chair, how much time is remaining on both sides?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma has 1 hour and 37 minutes, and the Senator from Massachusetts has 1 hour and 28 minutes.

Mr. NICKLES. I thank the Chair.

I think that shows the debate has been fairly equal on time, as it should be.

Again just for the notification of our colleagues, it may well be that we will be voting sometime in the neighborhood of 6:45 or 7 o'clock, if that is agreeable with the majority and minority leaders.

Mr. President, most of my comments this morning dealt with statements Dr. Elders has made. As I mentioned at that time, my problem with her nomination initially began because I felt many of the statements she had made were radical and extreme.

I have heard my colleague, the Senator from Minnesota, say they were taken out of context. I would just like to say that I have gone to great lengths to try to make sure that any of the statements I have used or any of the quotations I have used have certainly not been taken out of context. They are direct quotations.

I might also mention that in almost all the statements to which I referred, Dr. Elders, in almost every case, did not apologize for or retract the statements that were made.

Again, I find many of those statements quite offensive.

I also mentioned this morning I would spend the earlier part discussing her comments and statements. The second part of my speech would deal with her record in Arkansas, her record as director of the Arkansas Department of Health.

There are a lot of concerns I have. I will just go over these rather quickly. They are not concerns that are totally new, but I think they are concerns that need to be addressed as part of the record, to make sure the whole record is before the American people.

One of the problems I have in looking at her record as director of the Arkansas Department of Health dealt with her compensation. The Arkansas law, by statute, sets compensation levels for various agency heads or department leaders. The compensation level for the health department, which Dr. Elders is currently the head of—or was director of for several years—was \$84,273 for 1992 and 1993. Dr. Elders' compensation was \$130,000 for the last 2 years.

I do not begrudge her that compensation amount, but I do find it to be in violation of the Arkansas statute. The Arkansas statute really is very clear. This is in section 19-4-1601:

No employee authorized by the General Assembly shall receive from appropriated or cash funds either from State, Federal, or other sources compensation in an amount greater than shall be established by the General Assembly as the maximum annual salary for the employee unless specific provisions are made therefor by law.

It is very clear. Certainly her salary amount was not in compliance with State law.

Again, it is not the issue of compensation. It is not the fact that I think that she was overpaid at \$130,000. It is the fact that State law is very clear.

I might remind my colleagues, Gov. Bill Clinton was Governor at the time. The legislature was strongly controlled by Democrats in both houses. So they could have amended the law.

This was an issue. This was not a nonissue that just came up during confirmation. In looking back, there was a State attorney general's opinion on July 11, 1990. The attorney general at that time was Steve Clark, who had written a 10-page opinion. I will just read the conclusion portion. It says:

It is, in my opinion, clear, however, that a professional services contract negotiated for the purposes of avoiding applicable salary restrictions or other laws will be struck down by the courts. The invalidity of such contracts will be particularly apparent where, as here, the contractor agency—here the University of Arkansas Medical Service—arguably serves as a conduit to funnel extra compensation to a State employee who would otherwise be prohibited from receiving it.

Clearly, this is in opposition to Dr. Elders' pay arrangement. This entire, 11-page opinion was written in response to a question dealing with compensation for Dr. Elders.

Also, more recently, in an opinion dated May 13, 1993, Winston Bryan, who is the current State attorney general, responded to an inquiry from a State representative. Again, I will just read one part of a paragraph on a three-page opinion.

Dr. Elders, of course, is director of an agency in this State and as such is prohibited from receiving additional compensation under Arkansas code 19-4-1701.

So, again, it is very apparent from two attorneys general's opinions that her salary, her compensation agreement, was in violation of the State law. Evidently some State legislators were concerned about it because they asked for an attorney general's opinion, but it was not really corrected or amended during her term as director.

Again, I find that in violation of the law. I do not know why Governor Clinton and Dr. Elders and the legislature did not fix it. They have fixed it for future directors, but they never did during Dr. Elders' tenure. Again, it appears very clear that she was violating State law. Maybe nobody cares about that, but it seems to be kind of important. I would like to think that our Federal and State employees would be in compliance with the law.

Not in violation of Federal or State law that I could find was the fact that this year she has been receiving, or was receiving, compensation as a Federal consultant to the tune of \$550 a day plus \$135 a day expenses. She received much of that while receiving compensation as a State employee. I might mention her State contract was extended to the tune of \$14,000 a month.

It was terminated when the Governor of the State, again a Democrat, found out that she was receiving Federal compensation as a consultant in addition to receiving her compensation as a State employee to the tune of \$14,000 a month. Some people would call that double dipping. If you figured the fact that she is compensated not only by the Arkansas Department of Health but also by the University of Arkansas and by the Federal Government, many people would call that triple dipping.

Again, I do not believe or know that is illegal, but again it sheds some light that I found somewhat troubling.

Something more troubling, of a more pertinent nature that affects many people in this body and some other nominees, deals with the nonpayment of Social Security taxes. Dr. Elders and her husband have employed an employee, Audrey Ruffin, for several years to help take care of Dr. Elders' mother-in-law. They never paid taxes, never paid Social Security taxes, never paid Federal withholding taxes on this employee.

During the confirmation hearings, Dr. Elders had mentioned that Ms. Ruffin was paid as an independent contractor. As a matter of fact, she referred to that in one of her statements,

in response to a question from Senator COATS. She said, "Senator, it is my understanding regarding this, you know, like private duty nurses really are independent consultants or independent—"

Senator COATS says: "Contractors."

Dr. Elders: "*** contractors, and they handle their own. You pay them a fixed amount and ***."

She is implying they pay their own payroll taxes. I did not think a lot about this issue until I found out that in 1989, the IRS had contacted the State of Arkansas because the State health department was not paying Social Security taxes on several employees. The State finally had to pay back taxes to the tune of \$200,000 to \$300,000.

Dr. Elders was director of the department of health at that time. This letter that I have now, which was written on April 17, 1989, by Clay Parton, director of the division of in-home services for the Arkansas Department of Health, says: "In reviewing the documentation that you [the IRS] sent us, we understand that we should be treating these workers as employees." We are talking about physical therapists, registered nurses, personal care aides—of which Audrey Ruffin was one.

So this was a big issue that, frankly, while the State of Arkansas found out they were treating a lot of people as independent contractors, they were really employees. They should be paying Social Security taxes. The State agreed. The State paid the back taxes—under her department, under the department of health.

So the director of the department of health had to know in 1989 that you cannot call personal aides, or personal care aides, or physical therapists and so on as private contractors. Yet that is the way Audrey Ruffin was compensated. Let us just be very blunt. For Audrey Ruffin, no Social Security taxes, no withholding taxes were paid for several years. This denied her Social Security benefits, and it cheated the Social Security System out of money that it was owed. I cannot help but think that Dr. Elders knew that Social Security taxes should have been paid, since she was director of the department of health when this issue came up in 1989.

So, again, I am troubled by that. Maybe other people are not. But it happens to be against the law not to pay Social Security taxes. It happens to be against the law if you do not pay those taxes. It is not optional. It is not a maybe thing. We are not talking about a babysitter. We are not talking about somebody who works 1 day a month or somebody who comes in occasionally. We are not talking about an illegal, undocumented person. We are talking about a U.S. citizen who worked for Dr. and Mr. Elders for care of his mother, who has Alzheimer's, I understand.

This employment arrangement lasted for years. I have heard Dr. Elders say,

well, it was the responsibility of her husband. Frankly, I do not think, if you looked at legal responsibility, that would be the case, because the employee was paid out of a joint account and, frankly, both Dr. Elders and Mr. Elders had a lot of things to do—setting employee times, benefits, so forth. It was an employee-employer relationship with contingent liabilities to pay Social Security taxes which were not paid and, frankly, were not paid until you had a little confirmation concern, and then the taxes were paid. Then people say, "We hope that issue is behind us."

The fact is the law was broken. There is a law that says you have to pay Social Security taxes. If you do not pay the taxes, you can be fined thousands of dollars; you can be imprisoned. I make mention of that, and I couple the two. I look at the State law that says that State officials cannot have compensation in excess of a certain amount, and she was; and I look at the Federal law that says you are supposed to pay Social Security taxes, and they did not. So that concerns me.

Then there is another concern, I guess, that I have and that deals with the Bank of Arkansas. The Comptroller of the Currency reprimanded board members, including Dr. Elders, for violating national banking laws and safety and soundness laws. She violated the banking laws. I could go through the whole transaction. There were bank loans made, millions of dollars to an individual, and then they loaned money to another institution, which then loaned that individual some money. The Comptroller of the Currency said, "Don't do that." They warned the board members not to do it, and they continued to do it. Then the Comptroller came down and reprimanded the board members for doing so.

I do not want to make a bigger deal out of it than it is, but they violated the national banking laws. Again, that is another instance of a law being broken, certainly a case of ineptness, as far as oversight, on behalf of nine board members. I might mention that Dr. Elders was one of nine board members who were implicated in this.

They were also sued. There was a civil suit against all nine board members to the tune of \$1.5 million. It was settled shortly before the confirmation hearings began. The terms of the settlement are private. We do not know what they are. But evidently several people felt like they had a legitimate suit against the board members for violating the banking laws and sued for \$1.5 million, and they reached some settlement, of which we do not know the results.

I just make mention of that because I look at several of these things that have happened during her tenure in financial management, personal man-

agement, and the management of the department of health, and it concerns me. Again, I want to look at her record now, and not just some mistakes.

What about the record in Arkansas? What about Arkansas, as far as improving health care in Arkansas? Dr. Elders, I believe, made a statement that her No. 1 priority was to reduce the teenage pregnancy rate in Arkansas. By any standards, she has not been successful because currently the teenager pregnancy rate is at a 10-year high. They went from fourth worst in the Nation, when she began her term, to the second worst in the Nation. So the teenage pregnancy rate has gone up. They have had an increase of 15 to 17 percent every year since 1987. I might mention, in the early eighties, prior to the tenure of Dr. Elders, the teenage pregnancy rate had actually decreased by 10 percent. I also might mention that sexually transmitted diseases have gone up. Syphilis has gone up in Arkansas by 130 percent and HIV in Arkansas has gone up by 160 percent between 1989 and 1992. That concerns me. I do not give her full fault or credit for those statistics, but they happen to be statistics that are real and, again, I hope that we would not see duplicated throughout the country.

I just look at a couple of other things that have been stated and, again, I mention this—I will just read one quote and insert this in the RECORD. It is from Investor's Business Daily, August 2, 1993. It talks about scrutiny of Joycelyn Elders. I might just read a couple paragraphs:

How many parents outside of New York's East Village and San Francisco's Castro Street section really think, as Elders does, that sex should be part of the kindergarten curriculum?

Elders spent much of her time as Arkansas' health director fighting all those backward, reactionary parents who think that they—not the State—should control when and how their children are taught about sex. "The Surgeon General really does have a bully pulpit, you know, and I'll use it," Elders has promised.

If her record is any guide, she will almost certainly use it to push for national sex education curriculum—consisting largely of handing out condoms to school-age kids and teaching grammar school children to explore whether or not they are heterosexual or homosexual.

You don't have to be a follower of Pat Robertson or a devout Catholic to be alarmed by the sexual indoctrination of children. And, if the idea is to reduce teenage pregnancy and sexually transmitted disease, a look at Elders' record is less encouraging.

In Arkansas, the teenage pregnancy rate fell by almost 21 percent from 1979 to 1987, the year Elders took office, but has risen more than 7 percent since then. Since 1989, the infection rate for syphilis in Arkansas is up 177 percent, after slowing in the mid-1980's. Elders' condoms apparently didn't help.

Moreover, when many of the 1 million condoms Arkansas distributed in 1990-91 were found to be defective, Elders chose to keep it quiet.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print the entire two-page article by Investor's Business Daily in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Investor's Business Daily, Aug. 2, 1993]

BILL CLINTON'S BRAVE NEW WORLD

Candidate Bill Clinton said he wanted to reinvent government. Not a bad idea, but it appears he really meant using government to reinvent society—or, "to remold society by redefining what it means to be a human being in the 20th Century," as Hillary Rodman Clinton put it in a speech last April.

One look at the New Age thinkers and recycled 1960s radicals the Clintons are calling on to help "remold society" is discouraging, to say the least. And Lani Guinier, President Clinton's ill-fated nominee for the Justice Department's Civil Rights Division, is only the tip of the iceberg.

Guinier, you'll recall, supported "proportional representation," which would include giving minorities greater legislative power than their numbers warrant. When those extreme views came to light, even President Clinton abandoned her, claiming he had never read her writings and calling her principles "anti-democratic."

Less scrutiny has been brought to bear on Joycelyn Elders, Clinton's pick for surgeon general.

How many parents outside of New York's East Village and San Francisco's Castro Street section really think, as Elders does, that sex should be part of the kindergarten curriculum?

Elders spent much of her time as Arkansas' health director fighting all those backward, reactionary parents who think they—not the state—should control when and how their children are taught about sex.

"The surgeon general really does have a bully pulpit, you know, and I'll use it," Elders has promised.

If her record is any guide, she will almost certainly use it to push for a national sex education curriculum—consisting largely of handing out condoms to school-age kids and teaching grammar school children to explore whether they are heterosexual or homosexual.

You don't have to be a follower of Pat Robertson or a devout Catholic to be alarmed by the sexual indoctrination of children. And, if the idea is to reduce teenage pregnancy and sexually transmitted disease, a look at Elders' record is even less encouraging.

In Arkansas, the teenage pregnancy rate fell by almost 21% from 1979 to 1987, the year Elders took office, but has risen more than 7% since then. Since 1989 the infection rate for syphilis in Arkansas is up 177%, after slowing in the mid-1980s. Elders' condoms, apparently, didn't help.

Moreover, when many of the one million condoms Arkansas distributed in 1990-91 were found to be defective, Elders chose to keep it quiet.

Then there is Michael Lerner, the editor of the left-wing magazine *Tikkun*, dubbed the first lady's "guru" by Washingtonians. He advocates that jobless benefits "must be raised" to either the income an employee made in the six months before becoming jobless, or the median income in society over the same period, whichever is less.

In addition: "Companies would be fined, up to confiscatory levels, for those moves that negatively effect on the health of the com-

munity, unless they can show that they have done everything economically feasible to convert the facility to worker-controlled enterprises producing goods that might sustain future employment for those they previously employed."

But that mumbo jumbo is tame compared to Lerner's revolutionary socialism of 20 years ago.

In his 1973 book, "The New Socialist Revolution," he argued, "socialism . . . can be realized in this country only through revolutionary struggle." As leader of the "Seattle Liberation Front" in the early 1970s, Hillary's "guru" was indicted for a violent assault on a federal courthouse. How's that for reinventing government?

On top of this are the administration's more familiar faces.

Labor Secretary Robert Reich, for example, tells us that entrepreneurs are a vestige of America's past and that the stock market is only a short-term yardstick of the economy.

And, according to Health and Human Services Secretary Donna Shalala, "It's a myth that complex bureaucracies that are heavily regulated can't improve the services that they're responsible for." Translation: Look for more un-reinvented government.

Even Ruth Bader Ginsburg, the "moderate" soon-to-be Supreme Court justice, thinks the Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts, Boys and Girls Clubs and single sex prisons should all "eliminate sex segregation." She also feels that prostitution should be legal because it is a "consensual act between adults" protected by the right to privacy. Oh yes, and the Constitution also requires women to be drafted into the armed forces and to fight alongside men.

Every president appoints a doozy or two, but this White House is overflowing with officials—and we've by no means named all of them—with questionable backgrounds and leftist views that are out of touch with the typical American family. And they are poised to carry out a new agenda of social engineering few voters realized they were getting last November.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I am not going to belabor this, and I am not going to put too much in the RECORD. But here is another article, from the Arkansas Democrat Gazette, that says, and this is the headline:

DATA PUTS TEEN PREGNANCIES UP IN AREAS WITH SCHOOL CLINICS

In Pulaski County, the State began dispensing contraceptives in 1989 at Central High School, and in 1991 at Mills High School, both in Little Rock.

The teen pregnancy rate increased 8.8 percent in Pulaski County, from 1988-91, the latest year of data available.

That was a greater increase than statewide, which was 6.5 percent from 1988-91.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD, as well.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Arkansas Democrat Gazette, July 29, 1993]

DATA PUTS TEEN PREGNANCIES UP IN AREAS WITH SCHOOL CLINICS

(By Bobbi Riddlehoover)

Teen-age pregnancy rates have gone up in the two counties where the Arkansas Department of Health has been dispensing contraceptives for at least four years in school clinics.

The fertility rates and pregnancy rates of Arkansas teens have been under scrutiny because Dr. Joycelyn Elders, former department director and U.S. surgeon general designate, declared the battle against teenage pregnancy as one of her main programs.

The average increase for the three counties dispensing contraceptives is 9.9 percent, slightly lower than the statewide increase of 10.5 percent.

Arkansas has school-based clinics in 11 counties, but only four schools distribute contraceptives: Central High School and Mills High School (Pulaski County); Lincoln High School (Washington County); and Turrell High School (Crittenden County).

The pregnancy rate for 10- to 19-year-olds in Washington County, where the department has dispensed contraceptives since 1987, increased 3.4 percent from 1986 to 1991, which was less than half the state increase.

The National Center for Health Statistics cannot provide a national comparison for ages 10-19 for 1986-91. In the 15-19 age group, the teen pregnancy rate increased 5 percent from 1986 to 1988, said Stephanie Ventura, a NCHS statistician.

It is expected the rate of increase will be about 11 percent from 1986 to 1990, but all the data needed to determine that have not yet been compiled, Ventura said.

In Pulaski County, the state began dispensing contraceptives in 1989 at Central High School and in 1991 at Mills High School, both in Little Rock.

The teen pregnancy rate increased 8.8 percent in Pulaski County from 1988-91, the latest year of data available.

That was a greater increase than statewide, which was 6.5 percent from 1988-91.

The high school in Crittenden County did not begin dispensing contraceptives until 1991, so no comparison could be made.

Douglas R. Murray, director of the National Center for Health Statistics, said the department's statistics can be used to make Elders' program to fight teen pregnancy look like a success or like a failure, depending upon what years and ages are included.

During the last two years of the program, the teen pregnancy rate for the state dropped 1.5 percent, Murray said.

But for those three counties that dispense contraceptives, the drop was a more dramatic 4.6 percent, Murray said.

"You can say just about anything you want to," he said. "It depends on what you use as your starting and finishing points."

Elders made the point in 1990 that, although state statistics showed births to teen mothers ages 15-19 were 21.4 percent of the total births in 1960 and 18.3 percent of total births in 1987, the teen-age fertility rate was, in fact, increasing. The reason was the number of teens had decreased since 1960.

John Thomas, research director for the Family Council, a Christian organization that researches issues involving traditional values, said he is not surprised the pregnancy rates have gone up in those counties where contraceptives have been dispensed.

Julie Wright of Little Rock, regional director of a five-state area for the American Life League, the largest organization of abortion opponents in United States, said increases in pregnancy rates in those counties show Elders' programs "have not been successful."

Murray said county statistics do not reflect the success or failure of Elders' program, because they include girls ages 10-19, many of whom are not exposed to information from the school clinics.

Martha Hlett, assistant director of the Bureau of Public Health Programs, said success

of the department's program cannot be adequately judged by county statistics, because the program reaches only a fraction of teenage girls in each county.

The department has school clinics that dispense contraceptives in two of the six high schools in Pulaski County, in one of the five high schools in Crittenden County and in one of the 10 high schools in Washington County.

Detractors and supporters of Elders often quote teen-age fertility rates in Arkansas, calling them "teen-age pregnancy rates."

Fertility rates are rates of live births. The teen fertility rate is obtained by dividing the number of live births in a year by the population of women ages 15-19 and multiplying by 1,000.

Pregnancy rates are similarly obtained, except they include live births, induced abortions, fetal deaths and miscarriages.

Murray said he always put quotation marks around the phrase "pregnancy rate," because the data are not firm. Miscarriages are poorly reported at best, he said, and induced-abortion data are of erratic quality.

Statistics show fertility rates dropped in Arkansas from 1980 until 1987, when they began to climb dramatically.

From 1987-90, the teen-age fertility rate increased 16.98 percent in Arkansas, but increased slowly than the national rate. During that time, the national rate increased 18.38 percent.

Murray said one reason fertility rates are so high in Arkansas is the abortion rate in Arkansas is about half the national rate.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, in looking at some of the other positions that Dr. Elders has taken as director of the Arkansas Department of Public Health, we see an agenda that will also apply to her as Surgeon General. Talking about sex education in Arkansas, I have a letter from Dr. Glen Griffin, who is a member of the advisory board of the Medical Institute for Sexual Health. He visited one of these school-based clinics in Arkansas.

I will just read a couple of paragraphs that he mentioned:

I picked up a little comic book and pamphlet in the large, cheerful waiting room of the "Wellness Clinic" in Little Rock Central High School.

In the Andrea and Lisa comic, a "fairy godmother" rescues the girls by convincing them to use condoms when they have sex with their boyfriends.

Contrary to what we have heard, I did not find any pamphlets suggesting it might be better to wait for sex until marriage. Instead, a pamphlet sells the idea of playing around with sex by saying, "You'll never forget the feeling of safer sex."

Is this the message you want to have your boys and girls to be getting in junior high and high school?

I just say I do not.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this entire 2½ pages relating to Dr. Griffin's visit to an Arkansas school clinic under the supervision and basically at the initiation of Dr. Elders, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Medical Institute for Sexual Health, Aug. 3, 1993]

DON'T BUY A FLAWED "SAFER SEX" PROGRAM LIKE I SAW IN JUNIOR HIGH AND HIGH SCHOOL CLINICS IN ARKANSAS

(By Glen C. Griffin, M.D.)

If you are going to buy a car, you want to be sure it will work and get you where you want to go. I think the American people expect the same about choosing the nation's top doctor, the Surgeon General.

Since I knew that very few doctors, or parents, could visit the new Surgeon General, or the school clinics she advocates—I did, and wrote an editorial in the April 1993 issue of Postgraduate Medicine about what I found.

I picked up a little comic book and pamphlet in the large cheerful waiting room of the "Wellness Clinic" in the Little Rock Central High School.

In the Andrea and Lisa comic, a "fairy godmother" rescues the girls by convincing them to use condoms when they have sex with their boy friends.

Contrary to what we have heard, I did not find any pamphlets suggesting it might be better to wait for sex until marriage. Instead, a pamphlet sells the idea of playing around with sex by saying: "You'll never forget the feeling of safer sex."

"You'll never forget the feeling of safer sex?"

Is this the message you want your boys and girls to be getting in junior high and high school? And do you want your young daughters having pelvic exams at school?

And think about the flawed logic of giving children condoms and contraceptives as advocated by the Surgeon General nominee:

1. In the Forest Heights Junior High in Little Rock, I was told the girls are given their choice of contraceptives. Many people think that school clinics hand out condoms to prevent teen pregnancies. But the people running these programs know that condoms don't work very well to prevent pregnancy in kids. And at least 20% of girls who rely on condoms get pregnant within a year or so. Because of this the pill and 5 year implants are encouraged. In the Planned Parenthood magazine, Family Planning Perspectives an article states that in one public clinic 96% of the girls chose the pill.

2. Obviously, the pill or an implant are NO PROTECTION against AIDS or other sexually transmitted diseases.

3. So condoms are encouraged and passed out—10,000 last year in the Little Rock Central High School. But in a national survey only 3% of girls on the pill use condoms. And since condom failure rates are so high anyway among teens even when they are always used the program is a failure.

Remember, the condom failure rate is one-in-five in preventing pregnancy when a girl can get pregnant only a few days a month. Think of the failure rate in preventing AIDS, a 100% killer, and other sexually transmitted diseases, when boys and girls are vulnerable to them every day of every month—even if condoms are used.

THIS PLAN IS NOT MEDICALLY LOGICAL

Giving contraceptives to kids enables them to engage in a dangerous self-defeating behavior some call "safer sex" which isn't safe at all.

You don't buy a used car that has a major problem.

And you don't have to buy this teen condom/pill program that has a major problem.

There is a better way.

Quietly and successfully there are hundreds of schools across America that help

kids develop confidence and self-worth so they don't need drugs, other counterfeit highs, or sex to make them feel important and needed.

Dr. Elders has emphatically said the way to solve the teen drug problem is to teach kids to say "no." But in her confirmation hearings she said that if she knew how to teach about abstinence, she would. Well, there are people, thousands of teachers, doctors, and millions of parents in this country who do know how.

The young people of this country are smart and deserve our confidence. Yes, some of them are going to make some mistakes. But they are much less likely to make big mistakes about sex if all of us give them time tested principles to live by. And one of these important principles is that the only really safe sex is between two faithful marriage partners who are free of sexually transmitted diseases.

And this no-risk sex is worth waiting for.

What do other doctors think? It is disappointing that some of the medical organizations we belong to advocate pills and condoms for kids. But the Medical Institute for Sexual Health and Postgraduate Medicine have received stacks of letters and countless phone calls from doctors and parents who agree that the answer to teen pregnancy and AIDS is not condoms and pills.

Don't buy a medically flawed "safer sex" program like I saw in the school clinics in Arkansas.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, Dr. Elders has made a lot of controversial statements concerning condoms. Some people have said, well, she has a love affair with condoms. And some people have addressed her as "the condom queen." I have not said that. But I have read so many statements that she has made concerning condoms and her obsession with condoms that it really concerns me. I think everyone is familiar with the quotation where she said: "I tell every girl that when she goes out on a date, put a condom in her purse."

I do not know that many of my colleagues are aware of her position on condom advertisements. She was asked a question. "Do you support advertising condoms on television?"

Her answer:

I do support advertising condoms on television. We need to make condoms an everyday item of personal hygiene for people who choose to be sexually active outside of monogamous relationships. Otherwise we are never going to successfully fight the spread of AIDS. We are not doing a very good job of promoting condoms. If confirmed I will work to increase the acceptability of condoms among all populations within our country by using every tool available including the media. I feel very strong about this."

I do not doubt that she feels very strong about it. Maybe that is partly what concerns me.

I do not know if any of my colleagues have read statements that were made, or read a letter that HHS is now sending out. Maybe this letter is going to change—I am sure it probably will—by the Public Health Service dealing with condoms and answering parents who are concerned about condoms. This is from the Department of Health and

Human Services. It is signed by William Archer, who has been the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Population Affairs. I do not know if he still has that position or not. I kind of doubt it with this administration.

But let me just read four or five of the paragraphs, because again, Dr. Elders, as I just mentioned, wants to advertise condoms; she wants them available in school-based clinics and available for everybody.

This is from the Department of Health and Human Services. It is a letter that is given if someone requests information on condoms, how safe they are; this is the letter that they would have received from the Department of Health and Human Services.

Condom education has been touted as the great cure all for AIDS and pregnancy among teens. It is not. Sexually transmitted diseases [STD's] are epidemic among adolescents.

One out of three sexually active teenagers will acquire an STD before graduating from high school. And in most cases, a condom would have done little to stop it. Condoms have an 18 percent failure rate for pregnancy for teenagers, which means that one in five teenagers depending on them ends up pregnant. Low-income adolescents—who, for reasons not fully understood—have a 27- to 50-percent chance of getting pregnant while using a condom.

Studies suggest that condoms offer even less protection against STD's. A girl can get pregnant only a few days each month—she can catch or pass on an STD any day of the month.

A study which looked at a group of monogamous couples in which one partner was HIV positive found a 17-percent transmission rate of the virus at 18 months, despite consistent use of a condom.

Mr. President, I have several other statements by different groups. I will just mention a couple. I will insert them in the RECORD.

The Medical Institute for Sexual Health:

Since contraceptives started being given to kids, teen pregnancies have soared—and so have sexually transmitted diseases. Think about the flawed logic of the policy advocated by the Surgeon General nominee:

1. 20% of girls using condoms get pregnant each year. So in schools and contraceptive clinics, teens are given their choice of contraceptives. A big majority of teens in these clinics choose the pill—but some choose a five-year implant.

2. The pill or implant provides no protection against AIDS or other sexually transmitted diseases.

3. So condoms are encouraged and passed out. But only 4% of girls on the pill use condoms. Because of the one-in-five failure rate in preventing pregnancy, when a girl can get pregnant a few days a month, think of the failure rate in preventing AIDS and other sexually transmitted diseases when boys and girls are vulnerable to them every day of every month. Even if condoms are always used, the program has failed.

THIS PLAN IS NOT MEDICALLY LOGICAL

Giving contraceptives to kids enables them to engage in a dangerous self-defeating behavior called "safer sex" which isn't safe at all.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this statement by the Medical Institute for Sexual Health be printed in the RECORD, as well as a statement by the World Medical Health Foundation which basically blasts Dr. Elders' position. I will read two paragraphs of it.

The issue for most parents throughout America is not the question of the need for sex education and AIDS prevention; it is rather what kind of educational approach will truly save lives and reduce suffering.

I agree with that 100 percent.

It is here that we must take more than a superficial look at the problem.

For the sake of our young people, we must not allow this issue to be politicized. We have to put our political and theoretical considerations aside and look objectively at our options, define what is and is not working and plan our medical and educational policies accordingly.

The so-called "comprehensive sex educational approach" being advocated by Dr. Elders has already been used for more than twenty years. The federal government has spent more than two billion dollars through its Title X Program teaching and studying contraceptive-based sex education. Not one of these programs in all of these years has shown a significant and consistent decrease in sexual activity, pregnancy rates or rates of sexually transmitted disease.

Such so-called "education" is very destructive for our youth, raises their curiosity, encourages sexual experimentation, and puts them at increasing risk for HIV and other sexually transmitted diseases. While some may call this comprehensive sex education, others of us consider it child abuse.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Medical Institute for Sexual Health, Aug. 2, 1992]

PHYSICIANS PREDICT AN INCREASE OF AIDS (AND OTHER SEXUAL DISEASES) IN TEENS WITH SURGEON GENERAL NOMINEE'S PLAN

Since contraceptives started being given to kids, teen pregnancies have soared—and so have sexually transmitted diseases. Think about the flawed logic of the policy advocated by the Surgeon General nominee:

1. 20% of girls using condoms get pregnant each year. So in schools and contraceptive clinics, teens are given their choice of contraceptives. A big majority of teens in these clinics choose the pill—but some choose a five-year implant.

2. The pill or implant provides no protection against AIDS or other sexually transmitted diseases.

3. So condoms are encouraged and passed out. But only 4% of girls on the pill use condoms. Because of the one-in-five failure rate in preventing pregnancy, when a girl can get pregnant a few days a month, think of the failure rate in preventing AIDS and other sexually transmitted diseases when boys and girls are vulnerable to them every day of every month. Even if condoms are always used, the program has failed.

THIS PLAN IS NOT MEDICALLY LOGICAL

Giving contraceptives to kids enables them to engage in a dangerous self-defeating behavior called "safer sex" which isn't safe at all.

The Medical Institute for Sexual Health joins The Association of American Physicians and Surgeons in a news conference on

the grassy area of the Senate side of the Capitol to explain the flawed logic and dangers of giving condoms and contraceptives to kids—and to give a much better answer. Speaking for The Medical Institute for Sexual Health are William R. Archer III MD., and Glen C. Griffin MD., the editor-in-chief of Postgraduate Medicine, Jane Orient MD., executive director of The Association of American Physicians and Surgeons and Milled Jefferson, MD., assistant professor of Surgery at Boston University will also express their concerns.

[From the World Medical Health Foundation, Aug. 3, 1993]

STATEMENT BY DR. WILLIAM L. BERGMAN, PRESIDENT, WORLD MEDICAL HEALTH FOUNDATION, INC.

As a physician specializing in preventive medicine since 1980 and as president of a non-profit educational organization committed to an optimum health message for our young people, I have to express my serious concerns regarding the viewpoints being advocated by important policy-makers connected with President Clinton's administration including the current nominee for Surgeon General.

As Arkansas's health director, Dr. Joycelyn Elders has been outspoken in her crusade for school-based clinics and condom distribution.

The issue for most parents throughout America is not the question of the need for sex education and AIDS prevention; it is rather what kind of educational approach will truly save lives and reduce suffering. It is here that we must take more than a superficial look at the problem.

For the sake of our young people, we must not allow this issue to be politicized. We have to put our political and theoretical considerations aside and look objectively at our options, define what is and is not working and plan our medical and educational policies accordingly.

The so-called "comprehensive sex educational approach" being advocated by Dr. Elders has already been used for more than twenty years. The federal government has spent more than two billion dollars through its Title X Program teaching and studying contraceptive-based sex education. Not one of these programs in all of these years has shown a significant and consistent decrease in sexual activity, pregnancy rates or rates of sexually transmitted disease.

Even with such a track record of failure, and in spite of the hopeful record of a number of abstinence-based sex ed programs that have been used effectively in various parts of the country, including a number of inner cities, proponents of condom distribution continue to try to force this on every American community claiming it is medically necessary. Secus is promoting a curriculum called "Guidelines for Comprehensive Sexuality Education—K-12" which contains material that very few parents are aware of. Most people don't realize that such a curriculum merely gives lip service to abstinence, but implies the kids will be having sex anyway so the emphasis is on equipping them for so-called "safer sex." For example, children ages five through eight are taught masturbation: "Both girls and boys have body parts that feel good when touched." High-school students are told that pornography is a positive sexual aid: "Some people use erotic photographs, movies, or literature to enhance their sexual fantasies when alone or with a partner."

Such so-called "education" is very destructive for our youth, raises their curiosity, encourages sexual experimentation, and puts

them at increasing risk for HIV and other sexually transmitted diseases. While some may call this comprehensive sex education, others of us consider it child abuse.

Fortunately, not all teenagers are sexually active; a 1992 survey of the Centers for Disease Control reported that nearly half of all students have never had premarital intercourse. What does a condom distribution program say to these kids. And for those who are sexually active, since when did we give up on discouraging unhealthy or destructive behaviors; we didn't do it for alcohol, drugs or tobacco. Why then not encourage the healthiest options with regard to sexual behavior and explain rates of condom failure before we focus most of our efforts on how to use a piece of latex to reduce the risk of a fatal disease.

In conclusion, we would like to make a personal appeal to Mrs. Hillary Clinton. Certainly as a devoted mother, you share with millions of Americans the hope every parent has for the health and well-being of your child. Looking objectively at the track record of both the contraceptive model and abstinence model of sex education, what would truly be in Chelsea's best interest? As parents and as physicians, don't we always acknowledge that risk elimination is better than risk reduction, especially when infertility or death are concerned? And, in spite of the challenges, don't we always want to give our kids the best message. And isn't it true that whatever you would want for Chelsea would be the best for every other parents' son and daughter as well?

Finally, we would like to call upon our colleagues in the medical profession to investigate these sex ed curriculums more deeply before taking a position. Would you want the Sיעus comprehensive sex-ed program taught to your kids? As a profession, endowed with the sacred trust of caring for the health of our people, are we ready to abdicate our responsibility to speak out on behalf of the best health message for our young people just because doing so is currently unpopular or not politically correct?

A society that refuses to protect its own children is headed for disaster. Let us wake up before it's too late.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I made the statement in the past that Dr. Elders has a radical philosophy. She wants to distribute condoms. These statements by reputable organizations say they are not safe. They do not prevent diseases. They do not stop AIDS.

Yet Dr. Elders has been more than an advocate for distribution of condoms.

Senator COATS raised the issue of the fact that in her tenure as director of the Arkansas Department of Health she distributed and did not recall a lot of condoms that were defective. I happen to share Senator COATS' assessment that, that is grossly irresponsible.

Condom manufacturer Ansell was distributing a lot of defective condoms. Those defective condoms were reported in school-based clinics. Some of the reports came from people who were HIV positive and said that they break every time.

Some lots were breaking 10 times what is acceptable. Yet the State did not recall. One of the reasons they did not recall was because it would have been made public, and Dr. Elders and

others did not want to have a public issue saying: "These condoms are defective. They have holes in them. They break."

The Arkansas Department of Health did not make a notice, a general public notice. But they also did not even notify the various clinics which had been distributing them, or notify the individuals that had been picking them up. In some cases these are teenagers, picking them up every week or so. One high school distributed over 10,000 in 1 year. I think by just a couple of hundred users. So you had pretty consistent users. The Arkansas Department of Health did not even notify them that those condoms were defective, they might break. They were breaking. They were breaking at 10 times the minimally acceptable Federal standard.

Some of those users were HIV positive. Some people may die as a result of the fact that the health department would not even notify individuals. Dr. Elders and others took that responsibility. They said, "We don't want to do it. We don't want to let those individuals know."

So they took that decision. Unfortunately, I think some people got pregnant, some people contracted sexually transmitted diseases, and, unfortunately, my guess is probably some people died or will die as a result of that decision—a decision I might mention that Dr. Elders has not recanted.

Dr. Elders has other positions that I think are also troublesome.

She stated in the past, an article dated December 20, in the Salisbury Post, that she favors some marijuana use.

"If physicians feel marijuana would be beneficial for use by the patient it should be available," said Dr. Joycelyn Elders, Director of the Arkansas Health Department.

I will just mention that right now FDA says that is not a good idea, that it is not legal. Also, I happen to believe, and I believe it came out in the testimony, that the Clinton administration is opposed to it. But people should know that happens to be a position that Dr. Elders has taken, at least in the past.

The article in which she was quoted is dated December 20, 1992.

Mr. President, I have alluded to several things. I am going to conclude. Dr. Elders has made a lot of statements that I find very intolerant and very offensive to anyone who happens to disagree with her position, whether it be on distribution of contraceptives, with which I do disagree, or whether it happens to be on abortion, with which I disagree. Her characterization of people who oppose abortion as non-Christians with slave master mentalities I find very offensive, and intolerant, and bigoted. She has made a statement against the Catholic Church, for which she has not apologized to the church—she has not retracted that statement.

She did say, "Well, I should have said male governed instead of male dominated. I apologize." But she did not apologize to the 60 million Catholics for the statement. I saw a videotape which was very inflammatory, and we have addressed that. I find several of her statements to be disqualifying and several of her actions as director of the Arkansas Department of Health to be disqualifying as well. She has a record and should be judged on that record.

My principal reason in opposing her nomination is because I have four children. I have three girls. I do not want her giving advice to my girls. I do not want her telling my girls not to go out on a date unless they have a condom. I have a 17-year-old daughter. I have a 21-year-old daughter. I do not think that is the kind of advice I want them to have. I also have a 13-year-old daughter.

I am concerned about what may be coming down the pipeline for sex education. I am concerned, if there is an aggressive agenda that deals with sexual orientation and so on, you are going to find, if the public schools adopt that philosophy, a mass exodus from public schools. I have had kids in both public and private schools. Public schools tell us you cannot read the Bible, cannot have prayer in the school. But, oh, yes, we are going to give condoms away, and we will teach you about sexual awareness beginning in kindergarten. I think you are going to have real problems in public school.

I hope—and my guess is and I do not doubt Dr. Elders is going to be confirmed tonight—she will take some of the comments that I and several of my colleagues who found many of her past statements and past actions to be offensive, and keep that in mind when she considers her future statements. Hopefully, this process will have made her a better Surgeon General.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I yield the Senator from Nebraska 7 minutes.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, to visit with Dr. Elders, the nominee for surgeon general to be our top doctor in the United States of America, one must respect her talents, her intellect, her determination, her refreshing forthrightness and her proven administrative skills. She is no shrinking violet when it comes to speaking her mind and for this I do not fault her.

She may well be just what the doctor ordered for our Nation's medical needs.

But it has always been my perhaps old fashioned, out-dated philosophy that our Nation's medical profession does only a part of its obligation to its patients and therefore its obligation to the Nation's well-being if in the end patients are body wise but deficient in moral health and spiritual well-being.

My concern was well emphasized in the closing paragraph of a supporting editorial for Dr. Elders by the USA Today of this date, which well sums up the conventional wisdom of those who will vote "yes" and I quote therefrom:

With 335,000 teens a year becoming unwed mothers and 2.5 million cases of sexually transmitted diseases among adolescents reported each year, the Nation needs a straight talker.

For those inclined to vote "yes," I have no criticism. They and Dr. Elders may be correct. Maybe we should take a straight talk approach. This would endorse and prescribe condoms in the schools of America to cure or medically prevent VD, AIDS, and teenage pregnancies.

It sure sounds simple and it sure is new. As I understand it, it's just a matter of education and who wants to bother teaching abstinence? It seems to follow that the latter has not worked as the statistics show. But why has that ancient system failed and how wise is it to jump to something new and in so doing all but eliminate any chance of returning ever to the once generally accepted and successful formula?

Would it not be wise to pause to examine what happened and why the traditional system failed before we plunge into a new medically derived replacement?

I suggest, although it might be painful to some, that our current free spirit phenomenon with expert guidance from some members of the legal system may have played a prominent role.

Strange things have been happening in the name of freedom of speech, especially to our children and grandchildren. Often quoted and often held as correct by the courts has been a re-invention of the constitutional rights of free speech. One would almost think that our revolutionary Founding Fathers had written in blood in the Constitution protection for the profits of pornographers and perverts of children in sexually explicit material in movies, television, so-called music, books and magazines. Now it is suggested that because of all of this extreme freedom of speech success for our children we must now call upon our schools to rescue our kids from what our society has taught them on how to enjoy it all by supplying them condoms.

With all due respect to Dr. Elders, whom I consider to be a very dedicated person, dedicated to her agenda and sincere in her objectives as she sees

them, I must say to her and the honorable profession that she proposes to lead, I cannot buy, in good conscience, telling our schoolchildren that it is bad for them to eat candy, but condoms are good for you.

Mr. President, I wish to announce that I will vote finally "no" on this nomination.

I thank the Chair, and I thank my colleague from Oklahoma for yielding me time.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on behalf of Dr. Joycelyn Elders for the position of Surgeon General of the United States.

She has consistently worked to improve the health and well-being of the people of Arkansas, and has been a leader in such areas as ensuring early childhood education for all children, teaching parents parenting skills, teaching young males responsibility for their actions, and providing comprehensive preventive health services for all children in the State.

However, Mr. President, I must state frankly that while I am impressed by Dr. Elders' public health credentials, I have serious concerns about some of Dr. Elders' public statements, particularly as they are reported to relate to the Catholic Church.

Mr. President, I am certainly aware that as a public figure, remarks are sometimes taken out of context and misrepresented. That may have been the case with some of Dr. Elders' comments. But as reported, her remarks are disturbing. Bashing any religious faith or even appearing to be insensitive is absolutely unacceptable to me, and it is especially so for someone nominated to an important position.

I was so concerned that I called Dr. Elders. She said to me the same thing she stated in her letter to Senator BIDENT.

I have the utmost respect for the Catholic religion and its followers. As someone who has experienced bigotry first hand *** I do not condone bigotry, and I will not tolerate bias and prejudice in the administration of any programs under my jurisdiction as Surgeon General, should I be confirmed.

During my call to her she reemphasized that she had no intent to denigrate anyone's religious faith and she abhorred bigotry in any form. I also know that Dr. Elders has apologized for the comment that offended members of the Catholic Church.

Dr. Elders' remarks may not have been intended to do harm, but at the very least, they show insensitivity to a religious group with a very proud history of providing health care to the poor and underserved in this country. It is my fervent hope that in the future, Mr. President, Dr. Elders will fight intolerance, in all its forms, and will always put herself in positions that can only be construed as supporting religious tolerance.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, it is hard not to admire the compelling life story of Dr. Joycelyn Elders.

The daughter of sharecroppers, Dr. Elders was able to rise out of poverty, and put herself through college and become a medical doctor. She rose to the top of her profession when she was named the head of the Arkansas State Health Department.

Dr. Elders is living proof that, in America, hard work and determination can indeed pay off, despite the obstacles one may find along the way. And I admire Dr. Elders for the many successes she has achieved.

But, Mr. President, what I do not admire is the apparent willingness of Dr. Elders to withhold the truth when the truth conflicts with her own personal social agenda.

During her tenure as head of the Arkansas Health Department, Dr. Elders purchased more than 1 million condoms which were distributed to public health and school clinics throughout Arkansas. When Dr. Elders learned that the condoms had a failure rate 10 times the rate permitted by the Food and Drug Administration, she kept quiet, failing to inform her patients, the young people of Arkansas, that the condoms were defective and that their use was no guarantee against unwanted pregnancies and sexually transmitted diseases, including AIDS.

Dr. Elders apparently believed that her condom-distribution program would be sabotaged if the people of Arkansas only knew the truth.

Mr. President, during this debate, there have been other charges made against Dr. Elders—that she is anti-Catholic and that she is rigidly intolerant towards those who happen to disagree with her on any number of issues.

These charges are serious, and in fact they may be true. But the bottom line for me is Dr. Elders' willingness to withhold critical public health information from the very citizens she was sworn to serve.

Can you imagine the firestorm of protest that would erupt if a pharmaceutical company knowingly failed to inform consumers that its condoms were defective?

Can you imagine your own personal doctor knowingly failing to inform you that the use of a certain drug or medical device could be harmful to your health, even fatal?

Can you imagine the U.S. Surgeon General covering up the truth when the truth happened to conflict with the Surgeon General's own personal views on public health?

Mr. President, Dr. Elders has many admirable qualities. As a Midwesterner, I admire her plain-spokenness, which was on display during her confirmation hearing before the Labor Committee.

But the fact that Dr. Elders would withhold information about the defective condoms and play Russian roulette

with the health of the young people of Arkansas is enough, in my view, to disqualify her for the office of U.S. Surgeon General. As a result, I will vote against her confirmation.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as America's chief public health official, the Nation looks to the Surgeon General for guidance. The position of Surgeon General is particularly important at this point in our country's history, given the extremely difficult problems facing our country, such as a high teen pregnancy rate, AIDS, and an inadequate focus on preventive care within our Nation's health-care system. These are real problems that must be addressed.

I met with Dr. Elders before the August recess, and we discussed her views on a number of serious public health problems and the programs she advocates and has implemented in the State of Arkansas to combat these problems. I personally admire Dr. Elders, whose dedication and enthusiasm as a public health official is immediately evident. However, Dr. Elders has made controversial statements that have caused me, and many of my constituents concern. There are those in this body who believe that just such a controversial figure may be good for the Nation's health care system—that a good shaking-up is what the system needs at this time. I do not agree. At this point in our Nation's history, as we confront the challenge of reforming our health-care system and dealing with the difficult public-health issues facing our young people and our Nation as a whole, I believe that our country sorely needs a consensus builder to deal with these difficult issues. I believe that we need someone who can bridge the many gaps in this very diverse and complicated society. We need someone to bring us together to work toward solving the significant public health issues facing our Nation. I believe that Dr. Elders is a sincere and well-intentioned public health official, but I do not believe, at this point, that she is the right person for Surgeon General of the United States.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise to express my strong support for the confirmation of Dr. Joycelyn Elders to be Surgeon General of the Public Health Service. It is time that we let Dr. Elders get on with the important job she has been preparing for most of her life: Chief public health advocate for our country.

Mr. President, we need to focus on the real world we live in, not the world we wish we lived in. The reality is that our Nation has deplorably high rates of teen pregnancy, infant mortality, and poverty. Too many of our children are abused, troubled, hungry, and hopeless. Childhood violence and death due to suicide and firearms are increasing at near-exponential rates. Incidence of AIDS and other sexually transmitted diseases are increasing in every popu-

lation in our country. I could go on, but I think I have made my point.

The real world is tough. The problems we face are tremendous. It will take a tough person, a person who is not afraid to face reality, to find solutions to these enormous and no longer undeniable problems. My impression is that Dr. Elders is such a person. Her background as a pediatrician, public health official, professor, researcher, and advocate for poor women and children, combined with her proven ability to lead and advocate courageous, though controversial, positions, are evidence of her strength and commitment.

Dr. Elders has proven her ability to educate, build coalitions, and reach consensus on controversial issues. As head of the Arkansas Health Department, she involved local school boards, clinics, community leaders, businesses, and parents in the determination of health services when she helped establish school-based clinics in the State. She recognizes the importance of local control and understands the need to ensure that families and community leaders are involved. After all, they are in the best position to know and understand the needs and health problems of their neighborhoods.

Dr. Elders is committed to comprehensive health education and preventive services. She is dedicated to refocusing resources and debate on prevention and primary care. Again, I urge my colleagues to support the confirmation of Dr. Elders to be Surgeon General.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise today on an occasion of great pride for our country, to signal my enthusiastic support for Joycelyn Elders for the position of U.S. Surgeon General.

We should all be proud to be Americans today, because nomination is what the American dream is all about. An American of limited means but unlimited heart, who by virtue of her own sweat equity has reached the pinnacle of an unparalleled career as a public servant.

This is a woman of great talent: A skilled physician, a respected scholar, a full professor in a college of medicine, and a respected manager of a State health department.

And what does she choose to do with all that talent? With all that experience? With those rare and remarkable skills?

What this self-made woman decides on is a life of service to her country:

First she served her country in the military.

Then she dedicated her life to service in behalf of the health of this Nation's children.

How lucky we are.

If they made a movie about Joycelyn Elders nobody would believe it. You have all heard the story: A three-room cabin, no electricity or indoor plumb-

ing, working the fields from June to December with her seven brothers and sisters. She first saw the need for medical care for the underserved right in her own family—as her brother, suffering from appendicitis, was taken 7 miles on the back of a mule to the nearest doctor.

And then—15-year-old high school valedictorian, magna cum laude college graduate in only 3 years, first African-American woman in her medical school, deciding that the focus of her practice would be the care of children, and the rest.

Talk about a role model. Now that I think about it, they ought to make that movie—but not until after the climax to this story has been written—that Joycelyn Elders has reached the goal of serving this Nation as its Surgeon General.

Dr. Elders had to overcome much adversity to reach this nomination, and, as in the movies, this climax is being drawn out by more adversity. But I think the good guys are going to win this one too. And that is because this adversity, these unfounded allegations, cannot compare with the barriers she has already overcome.

In fact, I can think of no one who is more qualified for this position. Dr. Elders has proven herself as a distinguished public health official and a tireless champion of health concerns for women and children.

In Arkansas she dramatically transformed what was a traditional reactive health agency into an aggressive, proactive, preventive health oriented health department. That is an urgently needed prescription for all of America today.

And look at all she accomplished in Arkansas:

Early childhood screenings up from 4,000 in 1988, to over 45,000 in 1992.

Immunizations for 2-year olds up from 34 percent in 1989 to 60 percent in 1992.

Initiation of a new screening program for sickle cell anemia in newborns that now reaches 40,000 infants each year.

Expanded HIV testing and counseling to every Arkansas county, now serving over 100,000 people in an effort to combat that deadly disease.

This is a leader. A woman who goes beyond rhetoric and gets results. This country needs Joycelyn Elders.

We need her proven capacity for excellence.

We need her forthright approach to the daunting health concerns we face.

We need her leadership in the crucial area of preventive care.

We need her success in directly delivering health services to the Americans who need it most.

We need her experience as a veteran of the military, and a veteran of the wars against poverty, teenage pregnancy, and disease of all stripes.

For all of these reasons and more, I urge my colleagues to confirm the nomination of this most remarkable American, Dr. M. Joycelyn Elders as Surgeon General of the United States.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President:

The person ultimately appointed must be the object of his preference, though perhaps not in the first degree. It is also not very probable that his nomination would be overruled. The Senate could not be tempted by the preference they might feel to another to reject the one proposed; because they could not be tempted by the preference they might feel to another to reject the one proposed; because they could not assure themselves that the person they might wish would be brought forward by a second or by any subsequent nomination.

Mr. President, this explanation of the role of the Senate in the confirmation process was eloquently described by Alexander Hamilton in Federalist Paper No. 76. The words of our Founding Fathers are just as relevant today as they were 200 years ago when they empowered the President in article II, section 2 of the United States Constitution to nominate,

*** with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, *** Ambassadors, and other Ministers and Consuls, Judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States ***.

Both the Constitution and the Federalist Papers which were written to advocate and explain the provisions of the Constitution clearly express a deference to the President's choice of his administration. The Founders designed the Government to let the President choose whomever he wished to help him run the executive branch. The Senate check is intended to be used only in extraordinary circumstances and, as Hamilton wrote, "to be an efficacious source of stability in the administration."

Although some may call it old fashioned or conservative, I respect this deference to the President that our Framers clearly intended. I have done so even when President Clinton has sent nominations to the Senate with whose philosophies I do not agree. I have, on the other hand, on a few rare occasions voted to reject some of the President's nominees.

After serious consideration, I voted against nominees who have proven to be hopelessly intolerant of conflicting views and who have used their offices to intimidate and harass their opponents. For these reasons I have voted against Roberta Achtenberg and Tom Payzant who had shown a clear hostility to the Boy Scouts of America, and Sheldon Hackney, who as President of the University of Pennsylvania, showed a clear indifference to the first amendment while he supported an agenda of political correctness.

The nomination of Dr. Jocelyn Elders raises the difficult issue of deferring to the President as the Founders intended or rejecting her. I have heard the oppo-

nents of Dr. Elders and they have legitimate and serious concerns. She is not the nominee I would have chosen myself. I agree that some of her comments in the past have been careless and offensive to those who take their religious beliefs seriously, including this Senator. The policies which she has pursued in Arkansas are not necessarily the policies I would support. However, having met with Dr. Elders and reviewing her record, I am not convinced she falls into that category of the President's nominees against whom I have voted.

Dr. Elders has stated to me and in her Senate testimony her belief that abstinence is the only absolute guarantee to prevent sexually transmitted diseases and unwanted pregnancies. That important message is one she must continue to advocate as Surgeon General. Through the Senate confirmation process she has learned the value of listening carefully to those with whom she disagrees. She agreed with me that strong families are the single best answer to many of the problems in our society.

For my final decision, I refer again to the helpful words of Alexander Hamilton in Federalist No. 76. If Dr. Elders is not confirmed as Surgeon General, Bill Clinton will simply offer another nominee with identical beliefs, because those are the beliefs of the President. Disagreement with the President's beliefs is not itself sufficient reason to reject his nominee. I shall defer to the President and vote to confirm Dr. Elders.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, today the Senate will vote on the nomination of Dr. Joycelyn Elders for Surgeon General of the United States. It is my pleasure to rise in support of Dr. Elders.

As my colleagues know, I have felt strongly about Dr. Elders since the moment I met her. That is why I accepted Dr. Elders' invitation to introduce her at her confirmation hearing when her Senators—Senator PRYOR and Senator BUMPERS—had to fly to Arkansas unexpectedly. I also spoke in support of her nomination before the Senate recessed in August.

Mr. President, I will not take the Senate's time by going into a lengthy debate about Dr. Elders' qualifications. We have all had time to familiarize ourselves with her background and beliefs, and to listen to the debate that has taken place with regard to her more controversial positions. And believe me, it is important for the Senate to examine and consider these positions. Certainly, a little controversy is healthy. For controversy often makes us address issues that are difficult to discuss. We have certainly seen the success of former Surgeons General who have tackled controversial issues head-on.

As I have said a number of times, Dr. Elders and I do not share the same po-

sition on all issues, especially the issue of abortion. However, on the issue of legalized abortion, we have agreed to disagree and move forward to do something to end the need for abortion—by improving the safety and reliability of contraceptives and focusing on educating our youth about life and sexuality. Thus, acknowledging we can work together to make abortion a moot issue.

Once again, I would like to reiterate my strong support for Dr. Elders. She has proven herself as a distinguished pediatrician, researcher, and professor. She is respected by her colleagues. And she is an enthusiastic advocate who will work to address important health needs in the areas of child health, prevention, and access.

Mr. President, Dr. Elders is qualified to serve as Surgeon General of the United States. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support her nomination.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise today in opposition to Dr. Elders' nomination to be the Surgeon General of the United States. A month ago, I spoke at length on this nomination, but I have decided to take the floor for a second time because I feel so strongly that this nominee is not well suited for the position of Surgeon General.

Earlier in the summer, I began to review Dr. Elders' extensive record, which includes policy positions and numerous public statements. After this review, I found that I do not agree with many of her views. Nor do most Iowans. To many of us, her public statements are offensive and inflammatory. Over the last month, I have received more than 1,000 letters from my constituents regarding her nomination. They run 10 to 1 against her.

This opposition does not surprise me. Her views and policies she implemented during her tenure as the head of the Arkansas Department of Public Health are simply not supported by my constituents. My constituents recognize the problems we face today. Teenage pregnancy rates are on the rise. The incidence of sexually transmitted diseases is increasing at an alarming rate and the rate of HIV is growing rapidly among the adolescent population. I recognize these problems and the challenges we face. However, I disagree with Dr. Elders on how best to combat them.

Some of Dr. Elders' supporters would say that I am behind the times. They would say that my views and the views of my many constituents do not recognize the problems of today. They would say that Dr. Elders' policies address the issues of today, and that her candor is necessary. Her supporters often point to Dr. Koop's candid manner. Dr. Koop was candid, but he was also gracious. I do not agree with Dr. Elders that it is time to teach teens what to do in the back seat of a car.

The American public does not have to be shocked into acknowledging the

public health issues of today. Unfortunately, this administration appears to believe that the public is ignorant of today's difficult issues. The administration also takes the stance that those who do not agree with their liberal agenda are stuck in the 1950's and behind the times. They have used a form of shock therapy to deliver their message. Perhaps they are the ones that are out of step.

Dr. Elders' candor and colorful quotes are well known by this body and the public at large, so I will not repeat more of them. However, I was shocked when I read them for the first time. I wrongly assumed that they were said tongue in cheek. I believe her manner of speaking is not appropriate for our Nation's top doctor.

I do not question Dr. Elders' medical qualifications. Her work in the area of diabetes has received national attention. She overcame many barriers to reach her level of success and I admire her strength and perseverance. I do, however, question her ability to exercise sound judgment and build coalitions of support around a particular initiative.

As a result of her candor, she has offended many groups and organizations. Her response to recent criticism regarding her comments about the leadership of the Catholic Church illustrates her callousness. She did not apologize for the offensive remark. She simply stated that she should have used another word when referencing the Catholic leadership. This is a pattern. Dr. Elders has not made just one or two inappropriate comments. The list is lengthy. I find this kind of behavior and judgment completely inappropriate for a high-ranking Government official.

The challenges we face in the decade to come are huge—AIDS, the resurgence of TB, substance abuse, and violence. These are only a few. These challenges must be faced, but I do not believe Dr. Elders is the best person to lead us in the battle against these issues. It is not easy for me to oppose a nominee. This is not a decision I make casually. The Surgeon General should be a healer and the source of wisdom. I do not believe that Dr. Elders possesses these qualities, therefore, I will not support her nomination when the Senate votes later this afternoon on her confirmation.

Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, before the August recess I outlined in some detail the qualifications of Dr. M. Joycelyn Elders for the position of U.S. Surgeon General. She is an intelligent and well-qualified advocate for the public health policies we need to put in place if we are going to make Americans healthier in the 21st century.

That is why I intend to vote to confirm her nomination.

But we cannot ignore, Mr. President, the serious issues raised by some of the

remarks she has made—remarks which have left her open to the charges of insensitivity and religious bigotry.

As a Roman Catholic, I find cause for concern in some of the statements she has made. But I believe that the President deserves a considerable degree of deference regarding the nominations he is entitled to make.

I do not find evidence in the record of the Elders nomination that would indicate that she is unqualified for the post. Barring such evidence, I will vote for her, or any other nominee the President proposes to the Senate.

But I cast my vote in the affirmative, let me express my hope that Dr. Elders will—by her performance in office—silence the echo of the controversy she has engendered.

Much will be forgiven one who performs an outstanding service.

We need only look to the example of Dr. Elders' predecessor, Dr. C. Everett Koop. In his case, an initial firestorm of controversy was followed by a proven record of excellence in office.

There is cause for concern in the Elders record. But also contained in that record is evidence that the nominee has terrific potential to use her talent for consensus—and be an extremely positive force in this administration.

To conclude, Mr. President, my vote for Joycelyn Elders is a vote for my hope of what she can be. To those who want to vote their fear instead of their hope, I ask them to look again at Doc Koop—and vote "aye," in the hope that a person of such proven talent, with the President's confidence, can and will do a great job as Surgeon General.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, I rise today in support of Dr. Joycelyn Elders, the President's nominee for Surgeon General of the United States.

Dr. Elders' record demonstrates that she has strong credentials for helping to bring about an improvement in health in this country. While we in Congress have been debating reform of the health care system for years, Dr. Elders has been making great strides toward improving public health in Arkansas.

During her tenure as the director of the Arkansas Department of Health, Dr. Elders succeeded in improving the utilization of numerous preventive health programs. The percentages of 2-year-olds who are immunized in Arkansas has almost doubled under Dr. Elders' leadership. The percentage of eligible women and children who receive nutritional services through the Women, Infants, and Children Program has also nearly doubled, and the number of children who receive early screening and treatment services through the EPSDT Program has increased tenfold. Finally, during Dr. Elders' tenure in Arkansas, the teenage birth rate grew at a slower rate than it did nationally, and teenage abortions decreased. It is my hope that she can

help bring about these and other improvements in Michigan and across the Nation.

In addition to her distinguished record as a public health professional, Dr. Elders has an outstanding reputation as a physician and as a researcher. She has earned support for her nomination from over 100 national health care organizations, including the American Medical Association. She also has the support of many Michigan organizations such as the Michigan Nurses Association, the Detroit Department of Health, and the Michigan NAACP.

Mr. President, Dr. Elders has overcome much adversity in her own life and has shown great courage in responding to public health issues in Arkansas. I believe that she will be a great asset to the U.S. Public Health Service and to this Nation. I urge my colleagues to support her nomination.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I rise today concerning the nomination of Dr. Joycelyn Elders to be the Surgeon General of the United States. After carefully examining her record and considering the views of my constituents, I cannot support Dr. Elders' nomination.

Mr. President, the Surgeon General is the Nation's most prominent doctor. This person directs more than 6,000 members of the Public Health Service Corps. Until now, the role of the Surgeon General has had limited authority to create policy. However, the Department of Health and Human Services is reorganizing. The office of Surgeon General will oversee a number of new programs, including disease prevention, women's health, and health promotion. As Surgeon General, Dr. Elders would have unprecedented policy-making authority.

The people of this Nation look to the Surgeon General for information and guidance. Therefore, we must question Dr. Elders' handling of the distribution of defective condoms. Tests by the Food and Drug Administration found that condoms distributed by the Arkansas Health Department had a defective rate approximately 10 times the acceptable limit. However, Dr. Elders made the decision not to inform the public of the risk of unwanted pregnancy or the transmission of a number of sexually transmitted diseases, including AIDS, presented by these defective condoms.

Mr. President, I believe the Surgeon General should be outspoken on the issues concerning public health. However, a number of the statements made by Dr. Elders over a period of years have been offensive and inflammatory. She has shown a great deal of insensitivity concerning families with Down's syndrome, various religion organizations, and members of the pro-life movement. I believe that an effective Surgeon General must create, build, and foster coalitions which may

include differing views. However, the type of alienation caused by many of her statements make such coalitions difficult.

Mr. President, much of our debate has concerned Dr. Elders' efforts to reduce teenage pregnancy rates. The fact is that during her tenure as Arkansas' public health director the rate of teen pregnancy increased dramatically, and Arkansas' rate of teen pregnancy became the second highest in the Nation.

Mr. President, I feel kindly toward Dr. Elders and would like to compliment her on the many honors and accomplishments she has achieved during her career. She deserves a great deal of credit. However, in view of positions she has taken on matters of national interest, I cannot support her for the position of Surgeon General of the Public Health Service.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the nomination of Dr. Joycelyn Elders for Surgeon General. I sincerely believe that she can make a real difference in addressing some of the very toughest health care problems which presently face our Nation. She has an extraordinary record and has had a distinguished career as a pediatric endocrinologist and public health official.

We need a Surgeon General who is not afraid to face controversy by bringing tough and emotional issues like teen pregnancy, contraception, abstinence, abortion, sexual molestation, sexually transmitted diseases, and infant mortality to the forefront of public awareness. I believe she can make an important and positive difference in the public health arena and that is why I am supporting her nomination today.

Dr. Elders is an innovator and a pioneer in the field of public health. She has compiled a distinguished record of achievements as a health professional in Arkansas, and I believe that she will be able to replicate these achievements on a national level. Under her administration she instituted policies which ensured that more pregnant women received early and regular prenatal care. These policies had a positive impact on the infant mortality rate in Arkansas. Under her administration the childhood immunization rate in Arkansas was dramatically improved when after-hours clinics were instituted and by initiating a policy that every child visiting a health clinic received immunizations when necessary. The childhood immunization rate of 2-year olds nearly doubled from 1988 to 1992, from 34 to 60 percent.

In addition, the percentage of clients eligible for the Women, Infants and Children Nutrition Program rose from 39 percent in 1988 to 67 percent in 1992. Health assessments for Medicaid-eligible children also rose from 4,186 in 1988 to 45,252 in 1992. As you can tell from these statistics, Dr. Elders is a strong advocate for preventive care. She not

only talks about prevention, but she has actually instituted initial policies that affected the quality of health of all Arkansas citizens.

As Surgeon General, Dr. Elders has stated that her clear goals would be to foster prevention, health education, universal access to primary care, support for the family, and continued support for the public health commissioned corps. She believes that the most compelling issues before us today relate to the issues surrounding AIDS, unplanned pregnancies, and health care access.

Of primary importance to me is Dr. Elders' ability to reach an audience of uncaring and irresponsible young people that I fear might be lost without her unique skills. She has demonstrated her talents in getting right down into the trenches and communicating with kids in the inner cities, as well as in poor rural areas—and in their language and manner. They might hear her more clearly, and listen to her more intently, and talk with her in a more constructive manner than could any other possible candidate for this important position. I believe she can talk the talk and walk the walk. She can communicate with these kids because she knows who they are and where they come from. She grew up in poor, rural Arkansas and knows about their poverty, their problems, and their potential. She lifted herself out of poverty and she has spent a lifetime working to help others who are vulnerable to illness or disease simply because they were impoverished or did not have access to preventive medicine. Because of this, I believe that she has the determination to be a great role model in the health care area.

I know that she has said several things that some, including myself and many of my colleagues on this side of the aisle, have found to be wholly offensive. I talked with her for nearly an hour in August. She has been honestly chastened by these events in this cauldron of controversy. She understands that she can accomplish so much more by discarding elements of her rhetoric which some find incendiary. I think she is very sincere about this.

For example, Dr. Elders has further explained her position on abortion by stating that she has "never been about abortion—I am about preventing unplanned pregnancies. And, I think we know that if we could prevent the pregnancy, then abortion becomes a nonissue." She is also a strong believer in abstinence. She told me of these views.

None of us who consider ourselves pro-choice are supportive of abortions; however, we do advocate giving women the choice. If confirmed, I anticipate that Dr. Elders would usher in a new era of family planning programs at HHS. I believe that my fine friend, President George Bush misread the im-

portance and significance of the abortion issue to the public, especially to young women. Because of his opposition to fetal tissue research, his support of the gag rule, and the focus on these two issues during his administration, the public disproportionately focused attention on President Bush's views on abortion. It was unfair. However, the result was that young women between the ages of 18 and 35 left our fine President in droves.

I believe that Dr. Elders will do her best to reduce and prevent unplanned teenage pregnancies. This is a priority for her and we need her tireless energy and advocacy in this area. As she told me when we met in August, teenage pregnancy "breaks my heart."

I am familiar with outspoken people. I come from a whole gene pool of similarly situated folks. Dr. Elders and I talked about some of those common character traits. She has heard of painful criticisms and I believe that she sincerely understands that she must turn down the volume a bit in order to avoid such problems in the future, and in order to do the most effective job.

I think her heart is in this job and also the right place, and I, for one, am willing to give her the benefit of what she tells me she has learned through this process. She fully understands now that she can accomplish greater things by discarding elements of her rhetoric which some might find divisive and offensive.

For these reasons, I am supporting Dr. Elders for the position of Surgeon General. We need a strong advocate for the health of the American public as Surgeon General. She has certainly shown us that she can overcome difficult challenges and controversies. We need here as an outspoken and powerful voice for preventive care, health education, and family planning in this country, if we are going to see the cases of teenage pregnancy and sexually transmitted diseases, including AIDS, begin to decrease. These are grave problems presently facing our country and we need to address them with a vengeance. I believe Dr. Elders can provide the country with the leadership to face these challenges, which so assuredly threaten to undermine the health and well-being of the American people.

• Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, today I rise to announce my opposition to the nomination of Dr. Joycelyn Elders to be Medical Director in the Regular Corps of the Public Service, and to be Surgeon General of the Public Health Service.

I understand that Dr. Elders' style is polarizing and divisive; I am concerned that Dr. Elders has received great attention for her ability to create controversy, rather than consensus. Many of her comments lack the compassion for the other side of issues that I feel is so necessary for her to be an effective leader as Surgeon General.

I am less concerned with the actual content of her controversial comments than I am with her seeming inability to respect the views of others and to build a consensus. My concern is that she may continue to stir controversy, rather than compromise and that the substantive concerns of today will be neglected.

As public health director of the State of Arkansas, Dr. Elders displayed bad judgment when she decided not to disclose information to the public on possible defects in condoms that had already been distributed to schools and clinics. The FDA found a defective rate more than the limit set by the agency. Besides displaying bad judgment, her record as a public official is unimpressive.

Because of these concerns I cannot, in good conscience, vote for Dr. Elders. However, if Dr. Elders is confirmed as Surgeon General, as I assume she will be, I hope that she will prove me wrong by promoting public understanding in the face of controversy and bringing people together to work toward solving the public health problems that face our Nation today. Because Dr. Elders has not convinced me that she is up to this important task, I cannot support her nomination. •

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, today I will vote on the nomination of Dr. Joycelyn Elders to be the Surgeon General of the United States. Few nominees have caused so much controversy or forced so many Members of Congress to rethink their own views about the public health problems facing this Nation.

In making my decision to support her nomination, I studied Dr. Elders' record thoroughly. I met with her personally and, as I'm sure she'd tell you, I asked her some pretty tough questions about her finances and her efforts to stem the problems of teenage pregnancy and the spreading of sexually transmitted diseases. And I have to tell you that, in many cases, I do not agree with things Dr. Elders has said or the way she said them. Although I am certain that her heart is in the right place, I think some of her statements show a lack of sensitivity to legitimate concerns of many Americans.

However, one thing about Dr. Elders stands out—she has the guts to say the things that need to be said. In talking about teenage pregnancy, she has emphasized the importance of the family, individual responsibility, and abstinence, as the best form of birth control. She has also been realistic—all the rhetoric in the world about family values will not fix the crisis this country faces unless we begin an open, frank dialog about the causes of these problems.

I think Dr. Elders' opponents would be surprised at what else I found in studying her record. Contrary to what we read in the newspapers and see on

television, Dr. Elders' principal interest is not to change the way we value families and intimacy in this country. Instead, Dr. Elders is a respected member of the medical community who believes in prevention and in advancing public health issues before they become public health crises.

During the time that Dr. Elders was State health officer in Arkansas, the percentage of 2-year-olds immunized against deadly childhood diseases increased from 34 to 60 percent. Although she acknowledges, with disappointment, that the number of teenage pregnancies in Arkansas increased during the time she served as State health officer, the increase was significantly lower than the national average and a true testament to Dr. Elders' dedication to solving this critical problem.

Despite my reservations, I know that Dr. Elders is a dedicated physician and administrator who understands that the public health problems in this country can't be solved just by better medicine or more money in the health care system. The only chance for a solution lies in acknowledging and understanding the problems and finding a way to prevent them before they start. Dr. Elders has not been afraid to do this, and I support her nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. KENNEDY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I have consulted with a number of our colleagues on our side. We have had a very, I think, valuable explanation of the wide range of different support for Joycelyn Elders. We have had a good discussion, and I am quite prepared now to indicate that just in 3 or 4 minutes we will be willing, if it is agreeable to the Senator from Oklahoma, to yield back the remainder of the time and move toward a vote, and that is my current intention.

So, I yield myself 4 minutes, Mr. President.

Mr. President, as we are coming to the time for the Senate to vote on this nominee, I want to say that we have seen the repetition of allegations and charges and distortions and misrepresentations targeted toward this nominee, which we have heard repeatedly during the course of our hearings in the time prior to the August recess and again here today. I think our membership knows and, hopefully, the American people know that no matter how many times you continue to repeat, repeat, repeat, and repeat various selective phrases and selected materials, this does not make them any more true. This does not make them any more accurate.

And what we have seen over and over again, as anyone who reviews this record, both in the course of the hearings, and the earlier debates, will find

that the allegations that have been made both here and in the earlier debates have been responded to. All one has to do is look to the record and understand it, and therefore, we could certainly go back into the responses to these allegations this evening. I will resist that temptation because I am satisfied that the record that has been made over the period of the earlier debates responds fully to these issues.

Joycelyn Elders responded brilliantly during the course of our committee's deliberations. Most of these allegations and charges and representations we have heard today were made during the course of those hearings, and she responded brilliantly, I believe, to all of the allegations and charges, and we had strong bipartisan support in reporting her out.

There should not be any real kind of question, Mr. President, to the charge that Dr. Elders is out of the mainstream in terms of public health policy—look at the wide range of mainstream health and education organizations which have endorsed her: The American Medical Association, not known as a radical health organization, is in strong support. The Hospital Association, the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American Academy of Family Physicians, the American College of Physicians, the National Medical Association, the American Nurses Association, the PTA, not known as a wide-eyed liberal organization, are all in strong support of this nominee, as is organization after organization. And why? They know the record. They know the job that Dr. Elders has done. They are not just paying attention to what she said in the committee. They know the record, the life record, the life experience, the life of dedication of this nominee. And they understand the public health problems we face as a nation.

And I hope, Mr. President, that after we vote—and we will have a strong bipartisan vote—we can, as I know will be the case with Joycelyn Elders, try to reach out together and try to work on so many of the public health problems which have been identified during the course of this debate. There are many, and they have not received the kind of national attention they deserve. We will be debating different health policy issues over the next few days, weeks, and months as the country focuses on health care policy and reforming our health care system. If there has been some advantage to this debate it has been in reminding all of us of the importance of public health and public health policy. As Joycelyn Elders has stated repeatedly, earlier intervention is much of the answer. It is the answer in terms of good health, in terms of well-baby care and WIC programs and immunizations and the wide range of outreach programs to the

youngest and the most vulnerable in our society.

I am delighted and proud to be a strong supporter of Dr. Elders. I think those, as we mentioned earlier, who know her best have made the strongest case for her, and I certainly hope that my colleagues will respond positively and, if they can, I certainly hope that they will vote for Dr. Elders. If they feel that they have to vote a different way, I hope they will reach out after the conclusion of this vote and try to find ways in which all of us can try to work with this remarkable individual. I think Dr. Elders can be one of the most important and successful Surgeon Generals in the history of this country.

Second, I want to thank the staff of Members on both sides of the aisle who have made this a bipartisan effort, working with the administration, particularly HHS, to confirm Dr. Elders. I would especially like to recognize the staff of the Labor and Human Resources Committee, including the staff of ranking minority member NANCY LANDON KASSEBAUM, and several members of my staff: David Nexon, Mark Childress, Ron Weich, Theresa Bourgeois, Paul Kim, and Brian Carey.

I will reserve the remainder of my time with the expectation of yielding all the time back after the Senator from Oklahoma, if that is his wish.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I finished my comments.

Mr. President, I tell all our colleagues I believe we are ready to vote, and I think we have had a healthy debate, I believe, in exposing some of the comments and positions of Dr. Elders, and I hope it will improve her tenure as Surgeon General.

I yield back the remainder of the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is all time yielded back?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield back the remainder of the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

Mr. KENNEDY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of M. Joycelyn Elders, of Arkansas, to be the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service? On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SIMPSON. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI] would vote "nay."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. AKAKA). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 65, nays 34, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 248 Ex.]

YEAS—65

Akaka	Glenn	Mikulski
Baucus	Gorton	Mitchell
Biden	Graham	Moseley-Braun
Bingaman	Harkin	Moynihan
Boren	Hatfield	Murray
Boxer	Heflin	Nunn
Bradley	Hollings	Packwood
Brown	Inouye	Pell
Bryan	Jeffords	Pryor
Bumpers	Johnston	Reld
Campbell	Kassebaum	Riegle
Chafee	Kennedy	Robb
Cohen	Kerrey	Rockefeller
Conrad	Kerry	Sarbanes
Danforth	Kohl	Sasser
Daschle	Lautenberg	Shelby
DeConcini	Leahy	Simon
Dodd	Lieberman	Simpson
Dorgan	Lugar	Specter
Durenberger	Matthews	Wellstone
Feingold	Metzenbaum	Wofford
Feinstein		

NAYS—34

Bennett	Exon	McCain
Bond	Faircloth	McConnell
Breaux	Ford	Nickles
Burns	Gramm	Pressler
Byrd	Grassley	Roth
Coats	Gregg	Smith
Cochran	Hatch	Stevens
Coverdell	Helms	Thurmond
Craig	Hutchison	Wallop
D'Amato	Kempthorne	Warner
Dole	Lott	
Domenici	Mack	

NOT VOTING—1

Murkowski

So, the nomination was confirmed. [Disturbance in the visitors' galleries.]

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. MITCHELL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to restate the rule of the Senate with respect to demonstrations in the Senate Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Demonstrations in the gallery are prohibited.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, it is my intention to proceed to the Department of Defense—

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, the Senate is not in order. The majority leader is attempting to give us the schedule basically for the rest of the week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

The majority leader is recognized.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, it is my intention to proceed to request that the Senate proceed to the Department of Defense authorization bill, to begin consideration of that legislation this evening, and then to continue discussions we have had with respect to

the national service conference report under which we would enter an agreement, interrupting the DOD bill during the day tomorrow for a period of time for debate and vote on the conference report.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1994

Mr. MITCHELL. I believe that proceeding to the DOD bill has been cleared, and accordingly, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consideration of Calendar Order No. 164, S. 1298, the DOD authorization bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1298) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1994 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

S. 1298, THE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1994

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I am pleased to bring before the Senate S. 1298, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994. This bill provides the authorization in law for almost all of the major functions under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Services, including programs and activities of the Department of Defense; the Department of Energy nuclear weapons programs; and civil defense.

This authorization bill continues the process of reshaping the U.S. defense establishment for a post-cold-war world. The bill responds to the need to restructure defense programs in light of declining force levels and lower budgets by increasing funds for readiness and training programs; redirecting DOD tactical aviation programs; and reducing funding for DOD space and intelligence programs.

The bill preserves critical defense industrial base capabilities, and strengthens the peacekeeping and peace enforcement capabilities of U.S. military forces.

Finally, the bill expands some key areas of the defense conversion and transition programs contained in last year's Defense Authorization Act to help individuals, communities, and businesses adjust to the effects of the defense drawdown. The Base Closure Communities Act of 1993 included in the bill, for example, will help the Defense Department and other Federal

agencies carry out President Clinton's five point program to revitalize communities with closing bases.

At the outset of this debate, I want to thank the ranking minority member of the committee, Senator THURMOND, for all of his help and cooperation on this bill and in every other aspect of our committee's work. Senator THURMOND has tremendous knowledge and experience on national security issues, and it has always been a pleasure to work with him. I have worked with him for many years during his membership on the Armed Forces Committee, and now it is a particular pleasure to work with him as the ranking Republican.

BUDGET IMPACT OF THE COMMITTEE BILL

Mr. President, I will just comment briefly on the defense budget and put it into context. Of course, we will be debating the details of it for the next several days.

President Clinton's fiscal year 1994 budget request for National Defense represents a 5-percent real reduction from the fiscal year 1993 level, and a reduction of \$12 billion below the fiscal year 1994 level proposed by the Bush administration. In just the area of procurement, after adjusting for inflation the fiscal year 1994 budget request of \$45.5 billion is 50 percent below the procurement budget of fiscal year 1990, just 4 years ago. People ask, "Are we cutting defense?" Absolutely we are cutting defense in very major ways, and I think everyone should understand that.

For the 5-year period from fiscal year 1993 to 1997, the defense budget was being reduced by \$386 billion by the Bush administration. President Clinton's budget proposals would add an additional reduction of \$123 billion over these 5 years, more than twice the \$60 billion in cuts he called for during the campaign.

In real terms, adjusting for inflation, the fiscal year 1994 budget request for the Defense Department represents a 24-percent real decline below the fiscal year 1985. Under current plans, the defense budget will continue to decline in real terms each year through fiscal year 1997. In that year, defense spending will be 33 percent in real terms below the fiscal year 1990 level and 41 percent below the fiscal year 1985 level.

The bill before the Senate today authorizes a total of \$261.6 billion in budget authority for the national defense function for fiscal year 1994. This level is approximately \$1.8 billion below the President's request and the budget authority level for defense in the budget resolution. This budget authority reduction will reduce defense outlays in the future. This reduction was necessary in order to keep defense outlays—that is actual expenditures, the actual dollars spent during a year—at the level requested by the President while adding funds for a military pay

raise as well as achieving the outlay savings from the base closure process assumed in the President's budget request.

Budget authority represents authority to spend funds, but that money may be spent over a period of time, while budget outlays is the amount actually spent in a particular fiscal year. But when people hear the term "authority," that means authority to spend, but in the case, for instance, of airplanes or ships, it takes several years to spend that money. In the case of outlays, that is actual dollars spent in a given year.

The committee bill is \$600 million below the outlay level requested by the President and contained in the budget resolution using the scorekeeping procedures of the Office of Management and Budget in the executive branch. However, if you look at the Congressional Budget Office scoring, the committee bill exceeds the defense outlay level in the budget resolution under the scorekeeping procedures of the Congressional Budget Office. It is my view that those procedures need adjusting, but I want everyone to understand we are under the OMB numbers, but we are above the Congressional Budget Office numbers, and we will be talking about that a considerable amount during the course of this debate.

Mr. President, I will demonstrate later in the consideration of this bill the very serious steps that would be necessary to reduce the fiscal year 1994 defense budget to meet the outlay target of the budget resolution using CBO scorekeeping procedures as opposed to OMB scorekeeping. Neither DOD, nor OMB, nor the Armed Services Committee agree with the CBO approach. I do not believe the Senate would support the reduction CBO would require. It is imperative that we get the Department of Defense, OMB, and CBO together to reach some resolution of their technical scoring differences. If they do not get together, then the implications when the appropriations bill comes up will be very serious.

The committee intends to continue to work to avoid making the drastic reductions in defense spending in one year that would be brought about solely because of scorekeeping disagreements which will have profound consequences but which are technical in nature.

I want to take a few moments now to summarize the major features of this bill for my colleagues and for others who may be following this debate.

Mr. President, over the last 6 months, at the direction of the Senate, the Armed Services Committee has conducted a thorough and a rather comprehensive review of the Defense Department's policy on gay men and lesbians serving in the Armed Forces. I will not go into detail on any of this tonight. I think we will be having de-

bate later in the consideration of this bill on this subject. But the results of our committee work are contained in this bill.

The committee has held a total of nine hearings as part of our review of this issue. We heard from experts in law, military history, and military sociology; from Members of the Senate; and from current and former military personnel here in Washington and in the field. Following President Clinton's announcement of his policy on July 19, we heard from Secretary Aspin and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and from the DOD general counsel and members of the military working group that worked on this issue for Secretary Aspin.

The results of our committee's work, Mr. President, are contained in this bill. By a strong bipartisan vote of 17 to 5, the committee adopted legislation that is consistent with the President Clinton's July 19, 1993 policy as articulated by Secretary Aspin, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the general counsel of the Defense Department in hearings before the committee. This 17-to-5 vote represents a majority of Democrats and a majority of Republicans on the committee. This legislation would codify the longstanding Defense Department policy of discharging service members for any conduct or statements that demonstrate a propensity to engage in homosexual conduct. Under this legislation, the Defense Department would be able to continue the policy of not asking questions about homosexuality during enlistment, and the Secretary of Defense could issue investigative guidance to ensure that DOD investigative resources are used wisely.

I add to this explanation, Mr. President, the point that all sexual offenses are to be explained to recruits when they first come in, not simply the question of homosexuality but sexual harassment or the other requirements in terms of expectations of the men and women who come into the military under the Uniform Code of Military Justice and under the regulations. So there will be complete explanations given not only at the recruiting stage but at a later stage as appropriate and as set forth in our report.

Our hearings have shown that this is an issue on which people have strongly held views. For many people, it is an issue touching on deeply held religious and ethical beliefs. For many others, it is a matter of individual rights, involving the fair and equitable treatment of individuals with a particular orientation who want to serve their country in uniform. Our committee's focus throughout this debate has been on the implications of any change in the current policy on the effectiveness of the Armed Forces to carry out their mission to defend the Nation. That has been our focus.

I think the resolution of this issue in the administration's policy, which is

codified in the legislation contained in this bill, recognizes the unique nature of military service and ensures that our military leaders will be able to maintain the high standards of morale, good order and discipline, and unit cohesion that are the essence of our military capability.

**SUBCOMMITTEE ON NUCLEAR DETERRENCE,
ARMS CONTROL AND DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE**

In the area of strategic deterrence and arms control, the committee fully funded most major weapons programs in accordance with the President's request; subjected a number of near-term ballistic missile defense programs to reviews for compliance with the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty; and adjusted the space and intelligence budgets in line with declining defense resources.

The bill consolidates funding of \$1.2 billion requested in the budget for surveillance and warning programs, including Brilliant Eyes, Follow-on Early Warning System [FEWS], Defense Support Program [DSP] satellite programs, Cobra Ball and certain classified surveillance and warning assets, into a single account under the direct control of the Secretary of Defense. We then reduced funding in that account by \$350 million below the requested amount, and directed the Secretary to evaluate a number of lower-cost alternative surveillance and warning architectures and select one that will be affordable.

The committee reduced funding for the Ballistic Missile Defense Office [BMDO] from the budget request of \$3.75 billion to \$3.2 billion by transferring \$253 million for Brilliant Eyes from BMDO to the consolidated surveillance and warning account, and by further reducing BMDO funding by \$300 million.

We directed the Defense Department to begin promptly reviewing a number of ballistic missile defense systems for compliance with the ABM Treaty, including:

Patriot Multi-Mode Missile; Extended Range Interceptor missile [ERINT]; Ground-Based Radar for theater missile defenses [GBR-T]; Theater High-Altitude Area Defense interceptor missile [THAAD]; Brilliant Eyes space-based sensor system; Upgrades to the Navy's AEGIS/SPY radar system; and Upgrades to the Navy's Standard Missile-2 [SM-2] interceptor.

We also directed the Secretary of Defense to evaluate the acquisition streamlining of the deployment of missile defenses in order to reduce the cost and schedule, without increasing programmatic risk and concurrency.

On major strategic weapons programs, the committee reduced the budget request of \$256 million for modernization for B-1B bombers by \$50 million in RDT&E and \$36 million in procurement; approved the budget request of \$983.3 million for 24 Trident II submarine-launched ballistic missiles; in-

creased Trident II advance procurement funds by \$24.7 million to preserve the option to restore the production rate to an economical 48 per year starting in 1995; and fully funded the budget request of \$1.4 billion for the B-2 bomber while fencing the procurement funding pending receipt of a variety of certifications by the Secretary of Defense.

For Department of Energy programs under the committee's jurisdiction, the committee approved a reduction of \$214 million from the budget request of \$11.5 billion. This level includes \$5.3 billion for environmental restoration and waste management activities.

I want to commend Senator EXON and Senator LOTT for their leadership on these issues in the committee as chairman and ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Nuclear Deterrence, Arms Control and Defense Intelligence.

**SUBCOMMITTEE ON COALITION DEFENSE AND
REINFORCING FORCES**

The Subcommittee on Coalition Defense and Reinforcing Forces oversees a large portion of our conventional military capability, particularly in the area of tactical aviation programs. For several years it has been apparent that the Defense Department has more tactical aviation programs in the budget than we can realistically afford given current budget levels and projected force levels. This year, committee recommended a series of initiatives in the area of tactical with a goal of establishing an overall affordable program and improving joint service cooperation.

The committee bill terminates the Navy's AFX Program and the Air Force's Multirole Fighter Program. In place of these two programs, we directed the establishment of two joint service programs. The Navy will pursue a derivative of the Air Force's F-22 as a high performance joint program and the Air Force will join with the Navy to make the F-18E/F a lower performance joint strike/fighter program.

To meet the near term requirement for a Navy air-to-ground attack capability, the Committee initiated a robust program to upgrade Navy F-14s by giving the F-14 bombing capabilities with the funds saved by cancelling the AFX and accelerating the retirement of Navy A-6 aircraft.

Finally, the Committee recommended that the F-16 Program be terminated since the Air Force has a surplus of F-16 aircraft and foreign military sales will be sufficient to keep that line in production for a number of years in the future.

Mr. President, the reductions in the F-16 and the terminations of the AFX and the Multirole fighter add up to savings of \$1.23 billion in fiscal year 1994, and tens of billions in the long run by avoiding the development costs to two new fighter aircraft.

So, \$1.23 billion is not a huge amount considering the overall scope of the de-

fense budget in one year, but we are talking about saving many, many billions of dollars over a longer period of time.

Peacekeeping and peace enforcement operations are becoming an increasingly important mission for our military forces, and the committee took several actions in this bill to improve our military's capability in this area.

The committee bill authorizes \$195.0 million above the budget request for procurement of a second JSTARS surveillance aircraft. This system, like the Air Force AWACS, is ideally suited to providing sophisticated intelligence and command and control over peacekeeping as well as military operations.

Mine warfare is a particularly problem in areas where U.S. forces are engaged in peacekeeping operations, and the committee added \$10 million to the budget request of \$20 million for countermining warfare research. In addition, the committee approved an increase of \$20 million to the Budget request to purchase U.S. communications equipment that could be loaned to other countries during joint peacekeeping operations. This will improve communications interoperability at the tactical level during peacekeeping operations.

The committee also added funds selectively to preserve critical capabilities in the defense industrial base which might otherwise disappear. The bill includes \$160 million above the budget request for AH-64 helicopters to bridge the gap until the AH-64 remanufacture program can be started. The committee also approved \$40.0 million to keep the TOW missile in production until the Army can survey the TOW missiles stored in Saudi Arabia during Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm to determine whether the recent performance problems experienced with the TOW missile are caused by those conditions.

The committee continued its efforts to promote the use of defense modeling and simulation in the areas of training, doctrine development and acquisition. The bill includes \$34 million for the Army to test a revolutionary concept of training an entire brigade on modern, inexpensive simulators. Because sophisticated training devices for disaster preparedness are lacking, the committee initiated a program to adapt Army training models for use in training local civilian authorities to cope with natural disasters. Another initiative in this area is the authorization of \$15 million to initiate a joint Navy-Advanced Research Projects Agency project to develop an integrated mission planning system where various operational units located in different locations can undertake coordinated planning and preparation of their assigned missions.

The committee also authorized a total of \$635 million for equipment for

the National Guard and Reserve Components. The Committee provided the funds in generic categories and directed the National Guard and Reserve components to purchase items of equipment which will assist these units in carrying out their domestic missions.

I want to congratulate Senator LEVIN and Senator WARNER for their leadership of the Subcommittee on Coalition Defense and Reinforcing Forces this year.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON REGIONAL DEFENSE AND
CONTINGENCY FORCES

In the area of regional defense and contingency forces, the committee sought ways to maintain technological superiority and match investment to force structure.

The committee took an important step to improve the efficiency of our investment in strategic lift by creating a new national defense strategic lift fund to compete strategic airlift and strategic sealift alternatives against each other. The committee authorized \$2.7 billion for the fund by shifting all funds requested for C-17 procurement and sealift procurement into a single account to competitively select the most cost-effective strategy to meet our strategic lift requirements. This will allow DOD to look at all of the options to improve our strategic lift capability and select the one that is most cost effective.

We have to get much more for our money in this area. We are going to have to improve our sealift and airlift, and the question is what is the most effective in terms of cost and capability.

If DOD decides after this competitive analysis to proceed with the C-17 program, the committee required DOD to report on the ongoing review of the C-17 program before releasing any fiscal year 1994 funds. In addition, since strategic lift requirements have not been considered in the current bottom-up review, the committee required a bottom-up review of airlift requirements before releasing any fiscal year 1995 funds for the C-17. This review would evaluate total airlift requirements, and the trade-offs between C-17, other military airlift, commercial freighter aircraft, and sealift.

For shipbuilding programs, the committee approved the budget request for three DDG-51 destroyers; two oceanographic ships; and one mine warfare command and control ship conversion. The bill also implements the outcome of a roles and missions review of tactical intelligence aircraft. Last year, the committee required a competition between Navy EP-3 and Air Force RC-135 tactical intelligence aircraft. The Department decided that for the long-term, it will consolidate this mission in one new system. DOD recommended and the committee endorsed completion of the service life extension and communications upgrades of the EP-3 fleet, and limited upgrades of the RC-135 fleet.

I want to congratulate Senator KENNEDY and Senator COHEN, the chairman and ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Regional Defense and Contingency Forces, for their usual excellent work on these programs this year.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY,
ACQUISITION AND INDUSTRIAL BASE

In the area of defense technology, acquisition and industrial base, the committee took a number of actions to maintain the momentum of the Defense Reinvestment and Conversion Program enacted last year while emphasizing manufacturing science and technology; maintaining the technology base; and setting the stage for acquisition reform.

The committee added \$281 million to the budget request of \$324 million for the industry and technology portion of the Defense Reinvestment and Conversion Program. This increase will maintain funding for this important program at the fiscal year 1993 level to convert defense industries to dual-use production. The committee also added \$153.3 million to the budget request to establish a Manufacturing Science and Technology Program that will develop manufacturing processes for new technologies.

For the Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program, the committee approved \$200 million an increase of \$100 million to the budget request. The committee also added \$15 million for historically black colleges and universities to increase the capacity of these schools to educate scientists and engineers.

Later this year, the committee hopes to complete work on a comprehensive bill to streamline and reform the defense acquisition system. This is a high priority for the Defense Department, particularly Deputy Secretary Perry, as well as for our committee, and we hope to have a bill ready for the full Senate in this area later this year.

I want to congratulate Senator BINGAMAN and Senator SMITH, the chairman and ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Defense Technology, Acquisition and Industrial Base for their leadership on these issues in the Committee this year.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MILITARY READINESS AND
DEFENSE INFRASTRUCTURE

In the areas of military readiness and defense infrastructure, the committee added funds above the budget request for high priority readiness programs; authorized funds above the budget request to accelerate environmental cleanup and restoration at closing bases; and adopted a series of legislative provisions to speed the economic recovery of communities affected by base closures.

These are matters of great importance to our colleagues, and to the communities surrounding these military bases. I will not go into detail to-

night but during the course of this debate we will be discussing those items in this bill in much more depth.

O&M funding is the area of the budget that has the most direct and immediate impact on military readiness. The committee made a determined effort to preserve the level of O&M funding requested in the budget, and the bill authorizes a modest increase of \$27 million above the budget request of \$89.4 billion for O&M.

The committee realigned funds lower priority programs to address shortfalls in high priority readiness areas. These realignments include an increase of \$300 million to the budget request of \$6 billion for depot maintenance programs to reduce the backlog of equipment overdue for repair and to prevent future degradation in equipment readiness. The committee also recommends an increase of \$100 million to the budget request of \$3.9 billion for repair and maintenance of real property to slow the dramatic growth in the backlog of real property maintenance on DOD installation.

The committee authorized an increase of \$150.4 million to the budget request of \$100 million for civilian personnel transition benefits authorized by Congress last year. This increase will allow the military services to make maximum use of these incentives to reduce involuntary reductions during fiscal year 1994.

The committee agreed to a series of provisions known as the Base Closure Communities Act of 1993. These provisions will help the Defense Department and other Federal agencies carry out the five-point program to revitalize base closure communities that President Clinton announced on July 2. These provisions will: Establish a base property disposal and reuse team at each closing base to provide improved access to transition and redevelopment help to local communities; Allow the Secretary of Defense to transfer or lease portions of properties on closing bases at no or reduced cost to local redevelopment authorities for economic reuse;

Expedite the DOD and Federal agency property screening process at closing bases so that impacted communities can begin a timely plan for economic redevelopment;

Permit DOD to lease to redevelopment agencies portions of closing facilities at less than fair market value to expedite reuse while the property is being cleaned up for final transfer or sale;

Direct DOD to work with State and Federal regulators to speed the environmental cleanup process at closing bases and focus on those parcels that are of greatest value for reuse; and

Provide increased planning grants to local communities to prepare and implement reuse plans. In addition, the Committee authorized an increase of \$5

million to the budget request for the Office of Economic Adjustment [OEA] to allow OEA to meet the increased requirements for community adjustment assistance from the latest round of base realignments and closures.

Mr. President, I want to thank the new chairman and ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Military Readiness and Defense Infrastructure, Senator GLENN and Senator MCCAIN, for their outstanding work in their new subcommittee assignments this year.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FORCE REQUIREMENTS AND PERSONNEL

Mr. President, the area of personnel and compensation is the area of greatest priority for those of us on the committee because no matter what weapons we have, no matter what technology we have, our military and our national security can only be as good as the men and women who serve. Their morale and their well-being and their overall quality is the top priority of our committee, and I think should be the top priority of everyone concerned about national security.

In this area the committee maintained a prudent glide path to reduce military personnel strength but at the same time continued to provide a quality of life to military personnel and their families. After careful consideration the committee decided to authorize a pay raise of 2.2 percent for military members effective January 1, 1994, so they will not fall behind the rate of inflation.

The committee recommends an active duty military strength of 1,622,200 for fiscal year 1994, 106,100 below the fiscal year 1993 level and 1,600 above the requested level. For the Reserve components, the bill authorizes a strength of 1,050,960 for fiscal year 1994, 28,940 below the fiscal year 1993 level and 23,460 above the requested level.

The committee concurred with Secretary Aspin's recent proposal to broaden opportunities for women in the military services. The bill includes a provision that would repeal the combat exclusion law prohibiting the permanent assignment of women to vessels engaged in combat missions, and authorize the Secretaries of the military departments to prescribe the kinds of duties to which women members of the Armed Forces will be assigned. However, the provision also requires the Secretary of Defense to provide Congress with any proposed regulations regarding the assignment of women in the Armed Forces before approving and implementing them.

Finally, the committee recommends a provision that would authorize the President to delegate to the Secretary of Defense the authority to temporarily call up units and members of the Reserve components within a 25,000 personnel limit. This flexibility in calling up members of the Reserve compo-

nents is consistent with the committee's long-standing recommendation to make greater use of National Guard and Reserve units in meeting our military commitments. This provision would require written notification to the Congress within 24 hours of the exercise of this authority setting forth the circumstances requiring the call-up and the anticipated use of the individuals or units activated under this authority.

I want to thank the new chairman and ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Force Requirements and Personnel, Senator SHELBY and Senator COATS, for their excellent work on this subcommittee this year.

CONCLUSION

Mr. President, it is very important that we complete action on this bill as soon as possible. The Appropriations Committees are anxious to get to work on the Defense appropriations bill, and we want to reach a conference agreement with the House as soon as possible to guide the appropriations process in the coming weeks.

Before closing, I want to convey our committee's best wishes to someone who is well known to all Members of the Senate, particularly those of us who work in the defense arena. Jim English, the staff director of the Appropriations Committee, suffered a heart attack several months ago. We understand Jim is expected to return to work in the near future to help in the final push to complete the appropriations bill on time. So we want to get our authorization bill ready for the appropriators, and our special wishes and good wishes go to Jim in terms of a speedy recovery.

Too many times we take our staff for granted here. But we have excellent staff members, and Jim English, who is not on our staff but who works with us on a daily and weekly basis, is certainly one of those outstanding members.

Before closing this evening, I want to thank all the members of the Armed Services Committee for their hard work in bringing the bill to the floor. There were some areas of disagreement on specific provisions of the bill but the vote to report the bill to the Senate was unanimous of all members in terms of Democrats and Republicans.

Mr. President, this National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1994 represents the culmination of a great deal of hard work by members and the staff of our committee.

Greg Scott and Charlie Armstrong of the Senate legislative counsel's office also made an indispensable contribution in preparing this bill. This is a good bill which continues the process of reshaping our defense establishment for the post-cold war world, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

We will be hearing from Senator THURMOND tonight, and again I want to

convey my thanks to Senator THURMOND and his capable staff for their excellent work. And I want to thank each one of our subcommittee chairmen and ranking Republican members who have the bulk of the work in this bill for their diligent work over the period of the last several months. We will be hearing from them in the next couple of days. Each one of the subcommittee chairman and ranking members will be making presentations relating to their particular sections of the bill.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, before yielding the floor to Senator THURMOND, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate resumes consideration of this bill tomorrow morning that Senator BINGAMAN be recognized to offer an amendment regarding metal casting and that any amendments to that amendment or language proposed to be stricken be relevant to that subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

Mr. THURMOND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] is recognized.

IN SUPPORT OF S. 1238, THE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1994

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I rise with my distinguished colleague from Georgia and chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Senator NUNN, to speak in favor of the national defense authorization bill for fiscal year 1994. The bill we bring to the floor today reflects our best judgment of the Nation's defense requirements, and is based on many long hours of testimony, analysis, debate, consideration of opposing views and where necessary, compromise.

I would like to thank the chairman for his outstanding leadership, and for the open, fair, and bipartisan manner in which he has conducted the committee's business. I would also like to thank the members of the committee and staff for the effort that went into this bill. As ranking member of the committee, it has been a privilege to work with Senator NUNN to bring this bill to the Senate. I believe it is a good bill, not least because all the members of the committee, Republican and Democrat, voted to report it favorably to the Senate. That does not mean that every member, including me, is happy with every part of it. But that is the nature of compromise. On occasion, members put aside partisan or parochial concerns for the greater good of national security, which this bill is designed to protect.

The chairman has already discussed the major elements in the bill, and I will not take the Senate's time to cover the same ground in detail. But I would like to highlight a few decisions

which the committee made in attempting to reshape our military into a smaller but highly capable force to meet the challenges of the future.

Despite the decline in defense spending, the bill maintains substantial U.S. military power, and provides increased funding to expand our ability to project that power wherever our vital interests are threatened. The objective implicit in our bill is this: No aggressor should believe that he can take comfort in the downsizing of the U.S. military. Only time will tell if we have provided sufficient resources to deter future aggression.

In passing this year's defense bill, the committee faced unique and difficult challenges. We had to content with a rapidly changing but still dangerous world—and without a clear picture of Pentagon priorities, since the bottom up review had not been released at that time. Potential threats, though real, are uncertain. There is tremendous pressure to cut military spending and reduce force levels, but the lower limits of those cuts have not been established. Consequently, we based our judgment on timeless first principles—on the fundamentals of American security which have not changed despite the dramatic revolution in world affairs.

Although the committee had to deal with many changes in the world security equation, there was still one constant—people. We focused on people not just because of the high esteem we have for our men and women in uniform, but also because we recognized that high quality people are the foundation of our military strength. I have fought in one war and observed many others, and have learned one important lesson: Superior weapons, equipment, and ample supplies are essential for victory, but the human qualities are decisive. Budgets and programs do not defend us, but men and women of dedication, skill, and courage. Warfare is not just a clash of machines; it is a moral contest, a clash of mind, will, and spirit. In carrying out our constitutional mandate to raise and equip the Nation's military forces, Congress must never forget this abiding truth. We must always support policies that nourish the mind, will, and spirit of the forces, as well as provide for their material needs.

This is why maintaining the ban against open homosexuals in the military is so critical. Our chief concern was with preserving the essential moral fabric of our Armed Forces, and I commend our distinguished chairman for the steadfast manner in which he handled this controversy. Our hearings were comprehensive and objective, and proponents of each side had an opportunity to be heard. But the committee never lost its focus, which was to assure that military effectiveness took precedence over all other consider-

ations. I believe that codifying the ban on those who commit homosexual acts or demonstrate the propensity to do so is necessary and proper. I am proud that we produced a fair and legally defensible policy; but above all, a policy which will protect the intangible human factors of mutual trust and cohesion essential to effective military units.

I am also proud that, despite the administration's decision not to request a pay raise for our service men and women, the committee was able to find funds for a much deserved pay increase of 2.2 percent. Military pay still lags behind civilian salaries, but this pay raise will help service members support their families, and assist recruiters in persuading young men and women of the benefits of military service.

Of course, the best people cannot remain combat ready unless there are ample funds for operations and maintenance. The committee funded the O&M budget request for the daily operations of our forces. In past years this account has been habitually underfunded or used to pay other bills.

America is first and foremost a great maritime nation and so our bill addressed the basic strategic and operational concepts which will shape the Navy as it enters the 21st century. By supporting the Navy's shipbuilding program, tackling the urgent need for modern sealift, and addressing the long-simmering problem of Naval aviation, the bill assures the Navy's ability to meet future challenges. It continues to support effective Naval and Marine Corps expeditionary forces shaped for joint operations and provides funding to move the Army's heavy combat forces more rapidly to the battle area. It emphasizes a reliable joint power projection capability and forward presence for stability and rapid response so that we can influence events, and not merely react to them.

To address the vital strategic lift issue, this bill requires a long-term, integrated lift plan for the Nation, and establishes the national defense strategic lift fund to support essential power projection needs. The fund will provide a logical means for the Secretary of Defense to develop a strong sealift effort while giving the C-17 a chance to prove itself in the airlift structure.

The committee also addressed the role of long-range, heavy bombers in projecting power. I heartily endorse the full funding of the B-2 program, and hope we can also find the funds to expand the capabilities of the B-1B as a conventional bomber. The B-1B is an outstanding platform in which we already have a sizable investment. Common sense dictates that we should spend a little more to get the maximum possible use from these 96 aircraft as we are forced to replace the aging B-52 fleet.

To maintain America's dominance of the skies under which our troops must

fight, the committee confronted the fiscal limitations of developing four new tactical aircraft. I believe we acted wisely and responsibly in terminating the Navy's AFX and Air Force multi-role fighter, and in directing both services to pursue two joint strike/fighter programs. Two joint aircraft based on the F-22 and the F-18 E/F will give us the capabilities of four, but at far less cost. Of course, the success of these programs will depend on the willingness of the Air Force and Navy to work together.

The committee paid particular attention to the defense industrial base. Companies that have been the backbone of our defense industry are facing an uncertain future as we reduce military spending. Last year Congress established a number of programs to help these companies make the transition from defense to commercial business through technology reinvestment. The committee supported this program again in fiscal year 1994 and authorized over \$600 million for the technology reinvestment parts of the defense conversion program while continuing to emphasize that technical merit should determine which programs are funded under this initiative.

In providing for the companies that build our weapons and equipment, and for the Armed Services that defend the Nation, we did not forget those communities which are suffering as a result of the defense drawdown. The bill contains a legislative package to benefit communities like Charleston which are losing much of their economic base to the base closure process.

As I observed earlier, I did not agree with everything in the bill. I mention two such items now, not because I want to refight the battles settled in committee markup, but to put my colleagues on notice that I will oppose attempts by the full Senate to do any further damage to certain programs.

First, I am disappointed with the bill's provision on ballistic missile defense. The committee's action to cut \$300 million from the administrator's Ballistic Missile Defense Office request may make missile defense of the U.S. homeland impossible—especially if authorized funding is further reduced on the Senate floor, or in conference with the House. Furthermore, since we all agree that theater missile defenses should be the top priority, I must take issue with fencing funds for theater defense programs pending an ABM Treaty review. This will certainly add extra costs and delays. Worse, linking our theater missile defense efforts so closely to the ABM Treaty could result in building less capable systems than current technology will permit. Unless we make the most of our technology, our theater defenses will not be effective against the highly capable missile threats emerging in the world's most troubled regions.

Second, I am disappointed that the naval spent fuel issue was not resolved. Federal court action has blocked the Navy from shipping spent nuclear fuel to storage facilities in Idaho. This means the Navy will have to stop defueling and decommissioning nuclear ships sometime next year. The cost could be immense, and spent fuel will pile on the docks in areas totally inappropriate for radioactive fuel storage. I hope that the parties who are in disagreement on this issue can work out an arrangement that takes into consideration the concerns of all and allows the Navy to continue the operations necessary to our national security without interruption.

The great political philosopher Edmund Burke once said that governing is the art of making choices, but that the choices often lie between the disagreeable and the intolerable. In our representative democracy the people delegate the role of making the hard choices to us, their elected officials. Standing in trust for them, we study, debate, reflect, and wrestle with the many competing courses of action. But finally the moment comes when we must earn our pay and justify our offices—for better or worse, we must choose.

Nowhere is that responsibility more crucial than in the area of national defense. We might choose badly in other areas of public stewardship, yet the Nation could survive most such bad choices. But the Nation cannot survive continued failure to choose wisely in meeting threats to our security.

As the Senate takes up the defense bill, some Members will no doubt argue that the collapse of the Soviet Union and Warsaw Pact, or our remarkable victory in the gulf war, justify even smaller military forces and deeper cuts in the defense budget. I would remind those colleagues that we still live in a time of great uncertainty. We cannot predict what challenges and dangers we will face in the future. We need only look at the violence and instability around the world to conclude that our interests, our forces, our allies, and our access to vital resources and markets could be attacked at any time and in any place.

We must understand that strong military capabilities and high levels of combat readiness, combined with the will to act decisively, are our only national insurance policy. Even this bill, as good as I believe it is, shaves the margin of safety very close. We simply cannot afford to degrade the capabilities and readiness of our forces any further.

As in the gulf war, the time may come again when the United States will have to act as a great power in order to remain a secure power. If that fateful day comes—as I believe it surely will—we must have the means to act. If our vital interests or even our

survival are threatened, the American people will not be satisfied with the excuse that the Armed Forces were simply too expensive; or that we had to spend the money on domestic programs or even deficit reduction. If such a day ever comes and we are unprepared, those who sent us here will rightfully hold us accountable. For if history has shown us anything, it is that ultimately the best economy is safety.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.
Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Georgia.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Barram, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and withdrawals which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations and withdrawals received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 5, 1993, the Secretary of the Senate, on August 9, 1993, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions:

H.R. 490. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands and improvements in Washington, District of Columbia, to the Columbia Hospital for Women to provide a site for the construction of a facility to house the National Womens Health Resource Center.

H.R. 2034. An act to authorize major medical facility construction projects for the Department of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 1994, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2264. An act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to sections 7 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for the fiscal year 1994.

H.R. 2348. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2667. An act making emergency supplemental appropriations for relief from the major, widespread flooding in the Midwest for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2900. An act to clarify and revise the small business exemption from the nutrition labeling requirements of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 110. Joint resolution to authorize the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to conduct appropriate programs and activities to acknowledge the status of the county of Fond du Lac, WI, as the "World Capital of Aerobatics," and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 157. Joint resolution to designate September 13, 1993, as "Commodore John Barry Day."

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 5, 1993, the enrolled bills and joint resolutions were signed on August 10, 1993, during the adjournment of the Senate by the President pro tempore [Mr. BYRD].

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of August 2, 1993, the following reports of committees were submitted on August 24, 1993:

By Mr. INOUE, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, with amendments:

S. 1121: A bill to establish the National Indian Research Institute (Rept. No. 103-129).

By Mr. HOLLINGS, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with amendments:

S. 1179: A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to provide authorization of appropriations, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 103-130).

By Mr. HOLLINGS, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment:

S. 1192: A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to release restrictions on the use of certain property conveyed to the city of Soldotna, Alaska, for airport purposes (Rept. No. 103-131).

By Mr. HOLLINGS, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, without amendment:

S. 1313: A bill to authorize a certificate of documentation for the vessel *Mystique* (Rept. No. 103-132).

S. 1330: A bill to authorize a certificate of documentation for the vessel *Serena* (Rept. No. 103-133).

S. 1331: A bill to authorize a certificate of documentation for the vessel *Whit Con Tiki* (Rept. No. 103-134).

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC-1383. A communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Program; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry.

EC-1384. A communication from the General Counsel of the Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to revise the authorized strength limitations of Marine Corps commissioned officers on active duty in the grades of major and lieutenant colonel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1385. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the assignment of special operations forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1386. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Joint Military Net Assessment through fiscal year 1994; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1387. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report relative to contributions made to the Department of Defense accepted as of September 30, 1992; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1388. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Army (Financial Management), Department of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the value of certain commodities provided by the Berlin Magistrate for the quarter January 1, 1993 through March 31, 1993; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1389. A communication from the Director of Defense Research and Engineering, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the fiscal year 1993 investment strategy for the Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1390. A communication from the Acting Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the 1993 military base closures; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1391. A communication from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a claim regarding a certain Navy contract; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1392. A communication from the Director of the Standards of Conduct Office, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to Department of Defense and defense related employment; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1393. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the expansion of the CHAMPUS Reform Initiative to Washington and Oregon; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1394. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Selected Acquisition Reports for the quarter ending June 30, 1993; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1395. A communication from the Acting General Counsel of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for civil defense programs for fiscal year 1994; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1396. A communication from the Acting Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the breaching of a unit cost threshold; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1397. A communication from the Principal Deputy Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to assistance to Belarus; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. KENNEDY, from the Committee on Labor and Human Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1318. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend the program of grants regarding the prevention and control of tuberculosis and sexually transmitted diseases, to revise and extend certain injury control programs, and to revise the program of grants relating to preventive health measures with respect to breast and cervical cancer, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 103-135).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. NUNN, from the Committee on Armed Services:

The following named officer for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, United States Code, Section 601(a):

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Daniel W. Christman, 302-36-9745, United States Army.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. WARNER:

S. 1442. A bill entitled the "James River Basin Flood Control Act"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. PRESSLER:

S.J. Res. 128. A joint resolution to designate September 17, 1993, as "Diplomatic Courier Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. RIEGLE, and Mr. DOLE):

S.J. Res. 129. A Joint Resolution to authorize the placement of a memorial cairn in Arlington National Cemetery, Arlington, Virginia, to honor the 270 victims of the terrorist bombing of Pan Am Flight 103; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. COVERDELL:

S. Res. 142. A resolution to express the sense of the Senate to recognize and com-

mend the American Business Women's Association; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

S. Res. 143. A resolution to commemorate the 175th year of operation of the University Hospital in Augusta, Georgia; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. RIEGLE (for himself, Mr. DECONCINI, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. BIDEN, and Mr. SARBANES):

S. Con. Res. 42. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the 60th anniversary of the Ukraine famine of 1932-1933 should serve as a reminder of the brutality of Stalin's repressive policies toward the Ukrainian people; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. PRESSLER:

S.J. Res. 128. A joint resolution to designate September 17, 1993, as "Diplomatic Courier Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DIPLOMATIC COURIER DAY

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation to pay tribute to a branch of our Department of State that is celebrating its diamond anniversary. This year, the Department of State Diplomatic Courier Service celebrates its 75th anniversary. Under the watchful eyes of U.S. diplomatic couriers, the U.S. Government has maintained a secure flow of information essential to conducting a successful foreign policy.

The classified messages and other sensitive material and equipment taken across international borders always have been essential to policymakers. As custodians of the diplomatic pouch, their efforts have proven invaluable to the security of the United States and our embassies in foreign countries.

Since 1918, diplomatic couriers have been loyal, prompt, and diligent in delivering official U.S. Government messages worldwide. From World War I to the end of the cold war, diplomatic couriers carried out their missions without fail, even under perilous conditions. During that time, five couriers have given their lives in service to their country.

For 75 years, the U.S. Diplomatic Couriers have played an integral part in maintaining our national security, preserving confidential communications to government leaders separated by vast distances, and helping in the monumental achievements of U.S. foreign policy. It is fitting that we honor more than two generations of dedicated official Government messengers on the occasion of their 75th anniversary. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. RIEGLE, and Mr. DOLE):

S.J. Res. 129. A joint resolution to authorize the placement of a memorial cairn in Arlington National Cemetery, Arlington, VA, to honor the 270 victims of the terrorist bombing of Pan Am Flight 103; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

MEMORIAL TO THE VICTIMS OF PAN AM FLIGHT 103

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on behalf of Senators LAUTENBERG, D'AMATO, SPECTER, JEFFORDS, MOYNIHAN, RIEGLE, DOLE, and myself, I send to the desk a Senate joint resolution to authorize the placement of a memorial cairn in Arlington National Cemetery to honor the victims of Pan Am flight 103.

One hundred eighty-nine Americans were killed when terrorists bombed Pan Am flight 103 over Lockerbie, Scotland on December 21, 1988. We believe that Arlington National Cemetery is a fitting and appropriate site for this cairn honoring those who made the ultimate sacrifice for their country.

Fifteen of those on the flight were on active duty in the armed services of the United States, and at least 10 were veterans. Some were accompanied by their families as they returned home to the United States for a holiday they would never celebrate.

The people of Scotland have generously donated the stones for the cairn, and the families of the victims will raise any funds necessary to cover the expenses involved in construction and placement of the cairn. Therefore, this cairn will not require any Federal funds.

The cairn will be approximately 11 feet high and 8 feet in diameter at the base. The families of the victims have identified a small and vacant plot of land in Arlington National Cemetery which is unsuitable for gravesites. Therefore, this cairn will not deprive the Cemetery of any land needed for the burial of others in the future.

This cairn will serve as a symbol of loss. Thousands of people in this country lost a loved one on Pan Am flight 103.

This cairn will serve as a symbol of hope. Many of the families of the victims have taken their personal grief and turned it into a force for positive change. They work tirelessly to improve airline security, to bring those responsible for the bombing to justice, and to remind us constantly of what can happen, and what must not happen again.

This cairn will serve as a symbol of resolve. We need to bring to justice all those responsible for the bombing of Pan Am Flight 103. In November 1991, two agents of the Libyan Government were indicted for the bombing. Despite United Nations sanctions, the Libyan Government refuses to turn those individuals over for trial. Recently, 55 of my colleagues joined me in calling for

an international oil embargo against Libya until those indicted are brought to justice.

Finally, this cairn will serve as a symbol of commitment. We must maintain continuing vigilance against terrorism. The bombing of the World Trade Center earlier this year and the recent plot to bomb several other buildings in New York remind us again that terrorism can easily reach our shores, and we must do all we can to prevent it.

I ask unanimous consent, that the text of the resolution may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 129

Whereas Pan Am Flight 103 was destroyed by a bomb during the flight over Lockerbie, Scotland, on December 21, 1988;

Whereas 270 persons from 21 countries were killed in this terrorist bombing;

Whereas 189 of those killed were citizens of the United States including the following citizens from 21 States, the District of Columbia, and United States citizens living abroad:

Arkansas: Frederick Sanford Phillips;
California: Jerry Don Avritt, Surinder Mohan Bhatia, Stacie Denise Franklin, Matthew Kevin Gannon, Paul Isaac Garrett, Barry Joseph Valentino, Jonathan White;

Colorado: Steven Lee Butler;
Connecticut: Scott Marsh Cory, Patricia Mary Coyle, Shannon Davis, Turhan Ergin, Thomas Britton Schultz, Amy Elizabeth Shapiro;

District of Columbia: Nicholas Andreas Vrenios;

Florida: John Binning Cummock;
Illinois: Janina Jozefa Waldo;
Kansas: Lloyd David Ludlow;

Maryland: Michael Stuart Bernstein, Jay Joseph Kingham, Karen Elizabeth Noonan, Anne Lindsey Otenasek, Anita Lynn Reeves, Louise Ann Rogers, George Watterson Williams, Miriam Luby Wolfe;

Massachusetts: Julian MacBain Benello, Nicole Elise Boulanger, Nicholas Bright, Gary Leonard Colasanti, Joseph Patrick Curry, Mary Lincoln Johnson, Julianne Frances Kelly, Wendy Anne Lincoln, Daniel Emmett O'Connor, Sarah Susannah Buchanan Philipps, James Andrew Campbell Pitt, Cynthia Joan Smith, Thomas Edwin Walker;

Michigan: Lawrence Ray Bennett, Diane Boatman-Fuller, James Ralph Fuller, Kenneth James Gibson, Pamela Elaine Herbert, Khalid Nazir Jaafar, Gregory Kosmowski, Louis Anthony Marengo, Anmol Rattan, Garima Rattan, Suruchi Rattan, Mary Edna Smith, Arva Anthony Thomas, Jonathan Ryan Thomas, Lawanda Thomas;

Minnesota: Philip Vernon Bergstrom;
New Hampshire: Stephen John Boland, James Bruce MacQuarrie;

New Jersey: Thomas Joseph Ammerman, Michael Warren Buser, Warren Max Buser, Frank Ciulla, Eric Michael Coker, Jason Michael Coker, William Allan Daniels, Gretchen Joyce Dater, Michael Joseph Doyle, John Patrick Flynn, Kenneth Raymond Garczynski, William David Glebler, Roger Elwood Hurst, Robert Van Houten Jock, Timothy Baron Johnson, Patricia Ann Klein, Robert Milton Leckburg, Alexander Lowenstein, Richard Paul Monetti, Martha Owens, Sarah Rebecca Owens, Laura Abigail

Owens, Robert Plack Owens, William Pugh, Diane Marie Rencevicz, Saul Mark Rosen, Irving Stanley Sigal, Elia Stratis, Alexia Kathryn Tsairis, Raymond Ronald Wagner, Dederah Lynn Woods, Chelsea Marie Woods, Joe Nathan Woods, Joe Nathan Woods, Jr.;

New York: John Michael Gerard Ahern, Rachel Maria Asrelsky, Harry Michael Bainbridge, Kenneth John Bissett, Paula Marie Bouckley, Colleen Renee Brunner, Gregory Capasso, Richard Anthony Cawley, Theodora Eugenia Cohen, Joyce Christine Dimauro, Edgar Howard Eggleston III, Arthur Fondiler, Robert Gerard Fortune, Amy Beth Gallagher, Andre Nikolai Guevorgian, Lorraine Buser Halsch, Lynne Carol Hartunian, Katherine Augusta Hollister, Melina Kristina Hudson, Karen Lee Hunt, Kathleen Mary Jermyn, Christopher Andrew Jones, William Chase Leyrer, William Edward Mack, Elizabeth Lillian Marek, Daniel Emmet McCarthy, Suzanne Marie Miazga, Joseph Kenneth Miller, Jewell Courtney Mitchell, Eva Ingeborg Morson, John Mulroy, Mary Denise O'Neill, Robert Italo Pagnucco, Christos Michael Papadopoulos, David Platt, Walter Leonard Porter, Pamela Lynn Posen, Mark Alan Rein, Andrea Victoria Rosenthal, Daniel Peter Rosenthal, Joan Sheanshang, Martin Bernard Caruthers Simpson, James Alvin Smith, James Ralph Stow, Mark Lawrence Tobin, David William Trimmer-Smith, Asaad Eldi Vejdany, Keshia Weedon, Jerome Lee Weston, Bonnie Leigh Williams, Brittany Leigh Williams, Eric Jon Williams, Stephanie Leigh Williams, Mark James Zwynenburg;

North Dakota: Steven Russell Berrell;
Ohio: John David Akerstrom, Shanti Dixit, Douglas Eugene Malicote, Wendy Gay Malicote, Peter Raymond Peirce, Michael Pescatore, Peter Vulcu;

Pennsylvania: Martin Lewis Apfelbaum, Timothy Michael Cardwell, David Scott Dornstein, Anne Madeline Gorgacz, Linda Susan Gordon-Gorgacz, Loretta Anne Gorgacz, David J. Gould, Rodney Peter Hilbert, Beth Ann Johnson, Robert Eugene McCollum, Elyse Jeanne Saraceni, Scott Christopher Saunders;

Rhode Island: Bernard Joseph McLaughlin, Robert Thomas Schlageter;

Texas: Willis Larry Coursey, Michael Gary Stinnett, Charlotte Ann Stinnett, Stacey Leanne Stinnett;

Virginia: Ronald Albert Lariviere, Charles Dennis McKee;

West Virginia: Valerie Canady;
United States Citizens Living Abroad: Sarah Margaret Aicher, Judith Bernstein Atkinson, William Garretson Atkinson III, Noelle Lydie Berti, Charles Thomas Fisher IV, Lilibeth Tobila Macalooloy, Diane Marie Maslowski, Jane Susan Melber, Jane Ann Morgan, Sean Kevin Mulroy, Jocelyn Reina, Myra Josephine Royal, Irja Synnove Skabo, Milutin Velimirovich;

Whereas 15 active duty members and at least 10 veterans of the United States Armed Forces and members of their families were among those who lost their lives in this tragedy;

Whereas the terrorist bombing of Flight 103 was unquestionably an attack on the United States;

Whereas a memorial cairn honoring the victims of the bombing of Flight 103 has been donated to the people of the United States by the people of Scotland;

Whereas a small, vacant plot of land, unsuitable for gravesites, has been located in Arlington National Cemetery, Arlington, Virginia; and

Whereas Arlington National Cemetery, Arlington, Virginia, is a fitting and appropriate

place for a memorial in honor of those who perished in the Flight 103 bombing: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized and requested to place in Arlington National Cemetery, Arlington, Virginia, a memorial cairn, donated by the people of Scotland, honoring the 270 victims of the terrorist bombing of Pan Am Flight 103 who died on December 21, 1988, over Lockerbie, Scotland.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with my colleague Senator KENNEDY in introducing a joint resolution to authorize the placement of a memorial cairn in Arlington National Cemetery to honor the victims of the terrorist bombing of Pan Am Flight 103.

It has been more than 4 years since 270 innocent men, women, and children were murdered in cold blood when terrorists blew up Pan Am Flight 103 over Lockerbie, Scotland, while en route from London to New York. All 259 passengers and crew, along with 11 people on the ground, were killed.

Since that bombing, terrorism has struck its evil hand into the heart of New York City, killing and injuring while bringing the World Trade Center to a grinding halt. And only months later, Federal authorities thwarted a detailed plot to bomb the Holland and Lincoln Tunnels in New York City and assassinate Boutros Boutros-Ghali and a member of the U.S. Senate, ALFONSE D'AMATO. These latest incidents of terrorism remind us that we must work relentlessly to put an end to these needless tragedies. Winning the fight against terrorism is vital, for America and for the rest of civilized world.

The families of the victims of Pan Am 103 were encouraged when then-Governor Clinton pledged during his presidential campaign to help bring about a full and just resolution to the Pan Am 103 case. While there are many steps that must be taken to reach that goal, today we are focused on one important step to bring some comfort to the families of the Pan Am 103 victims and create a lasting reminder to the pain that terrorism brings. I am delighted that President Clinton has agreed to support this joint resolution to place the memorial cairn in Arlington National Cemetery.

The memorial cairn was a gift from the people of Scotland and will be erected at no cost to our Government. The cairn will be placed on a small plot of land in Arlington Cemetery which has been identified as unsuitable for gravesites.

The families of the victims of Pan Am Flight 103 have shown remarkable perseverance and resourcefulness in their quest to make certain that the Federal Government responds positively to the deaths of their loved ones. Even in the face of tremendous pain on that day in 1988 in the middle of the

holiday season, and every day after that, the families have fought for the greater good. It is my hope, and the hope of the families, that this memorial helps the bombing of December 21, 1988, to be remembered as the highwater mark of terrorism.

As an appointed member of the Commission on Aviation Security and Terrorism, as chairman of the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee, as a member of the U.S. Senate and on a personal level, I have worked hand-in-hand with the families. We were successful in passing the Aviation Security Improvement Act, which was a significant step forward in our efforts to protect travelers from terrorism. We have also worked hard to try to secure the effective prosecution of those implicated in this horrible crime.

Few matters I have worked on in my years here in Washington has touched my heart as has working with these families, many of whom have dedicated their lives to ensuring that the horrors of terrorism are transformed to a good purpose. In my time in Washington, and as a businessman in New Jersey, I have not known a group of people more committed to and successful in reaching goals. I am honored to work with these families and I pledge my continued support to their mission.

Mr. President, it has been more than 4 years since the bombing of Pan Am Flight 103. In that time, we've made progress in our fight to prevent a recurrence of a tragedy such as Pan Am 103 so that more families need not suffer. We cannot afford to let up on those efforts. This memorial will stand as a constant reminder of our need for vigilance against terrorism. I urge my colleagues to join me, Senator KENNEDY, Senator D'AMATO, and Senator SPECTER by passing this resolution and honoring the victims of Pan Am Flight 103 with this most fitting memorial.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 9

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Texas [Mrs. HUTCHISON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 9, a bill to grant the power to the President to reduce budget authority.

S. 466

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFFEE] the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BINGAMAN], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CONRAD] were added as cosponsors of S. 466, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide for medic-aid coverage of all certified nurse practitioners and clinical nurse specialists services.

S. 497

At the request of Mr. SIMON, the name of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] was added as a co-

sponsor of S. 497, a bill to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to authorize funds received by States and units of local government to be expended to improve the quality and availability of DNA records, to authorize the establishment of a DNA identification index, and for other purposes.

S. 575

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. MOSELEY-BRAUN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 575, a bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to improve the provisions of such Act with respect to the health and safety of employees, and for other purposes.

S. 618

At the request of Mr. RIEGLE, the names of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. PACKWOOD] and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE] were added as cosponsors of S. 618, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit the admission to the United States of nonimmigrant students and visitors who are the spouses and children of United States permanent resident aliens, and for other purposes.

S. 674

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the names of the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE] were added as cosponsors of S. 674, a bill to require health warnings to be included in alcoholic beverage advertisements, and for other purposes.

S. 1037

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. WOFFORD] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1037, a bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1991 with respect to the application of such Act.

S. 1071

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1071, a bill to provide that certain civil defense employees and employees of the Federal Emergency Management Agency may be eligible for certain public safety officers death benefits, and for other purposes.

S. 1111

At the request of Mr. KERREY, the names of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WALLOP], the Senator from Washington [Mr. GORTON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SASSER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. NUNN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SARBANES], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. FEINGOLD], and the Senator

from Texas [Mr. GRAMM] were added as cosponsors of S. 1111, a bill to authorize the minting of coins to commemorate the Vietnam Veterans' Memorial in Washington, DC.

S. 1118

At the request of Mr. HATFIELD, the name of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. LIEBERMAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1118, a bill to establish an additional National Education Goal relating to parental participation in both the formal and informal education of their children, and for other purposes.

S. 1124

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the name of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1124, a bill to enhance credit availability by streamlining Federal regulations applicable to financial institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 1154

At the request of Mr. DECONCINI, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE] were added as cosponsors of S. 1154, a bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to provide for the establishment of a Microenterprise Development Fund, and for other purposes.

S. 1256

At the request of Mr. DOLE, the names of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRADLEY] were added as cosponsors of S. 1256, a bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to examine the status of the human rights of people with disabilities worldwide.

S. 1276

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. BURNS], and the Senator from Illinois [Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN] were added as cosponsors of S. 1276, a bill to extend for three years the moratorium on the sale, transfer or export of anti-personnel landmines abroad, and for other purposes.

S. 1326

At the request of Mr. WALLOP, the name of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. PACKWOOD] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1326, a bill to establish a forage fee formula on lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior.

S. 1437

At the request of Mr. DOLE, the name of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DURENBERGER] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1437, a bill to amend section 1562 of title 38, United States Code, to increase the rate of pension for persons on the Medal of Honor roll.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 41

At the request of Mr. SIMON, the name of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBB] was added as a cosponsor of Sen-

ate Joint Resolution 41, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to require a balanced budget.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 75

At the request of Mr. ROTH, the names of the Senator from New York [Mr. D'AMATO], the Senator from Texas [Mr. GRAMM], the Senator from New York [Mr. MOYNIHAN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 75, a joint resolution designating January 2, 1994, through January 8, 1994, as "National Law Enforcement Training Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 90

At the request of Mr. ROBB, the name of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 90, a joint resolution to recognize the achievements of radio amateurs, and to establish support for such amateurs as national policy.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 119

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the names of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRADLEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFFEE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. COATS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. COVERDELL], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. LIEBERMAN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. RIEGLE], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PRESSLER], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. ROTH], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 119, a joint resolution to designate the month of March 1994 as "Irish-American Heritage Month."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 127

At the request of Mr. BURNS, the names of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. FAIRCLOTH], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT], and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 127, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting the imposition of retroactive taxes on the American people.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 16

At the request of Mr. SHELBY, the name of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 16, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that equitable mental health care benefits must be included in any health care reform legislation passed by Congress.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 30

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the name of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BRYAN] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 30, a concurrent resolution congratulating the Anti-Defamation League on the celebration of its 80th anniversary.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 42—RELATING TO THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE UKRAINIAN FAMINE

Mr. RIEGLE (for himself, Mr. DECONCINI, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. BIDEN, and Mr. SARBANES) submitted the following concurrent resolution which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. CON. RES. 42

Whereas this year marks the 60th anniversary of the Ukraine famine of 1932-1933;

Whereas during 1932-1933, an estimated 7 million to 10 million people starved to death in Ukraine because of forced collectivization and grain seizures from the rural population by the Government of the Soviet Union;

Whereas Public Law 99-180 established the Commission on the Ukraine Famine to conduct a study to expand the world's knowledge of the famine and to provide the American public with a better understanding of the former Soviet system by revealing the Soviet role in the Ukraine famine;

Whereas the Commission's report to Congress confirms that Soviet dictator "Joseph Stalin and those around him committed genocide against Ukrainians in 1932-1933" to repress the Ukrainian peasantry and to suppress Ukrainian self-assertion;

Whereas, on February 7, 1990, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine acknowledged that the Ukraine famine was artificially created by the policies of Stalin and his closest associates;

Whereas internationally accepted principles of human rights prohibit the use of food as a political weapon;

Whereas the official observances of the Days of Sorrow and Remembrance of the Victims of the Imposed Famine are commemorated this year on September 10 through 12 in Kiev, Ukraine; and

Whereas members of the Commission on the Ukraine Famine are presenting a copy of their findings and conclusions to the Government of Ukraine during the official observances in Ukraine; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

SECTION 1. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the victims of the Soviet-engineered Ukraine famine of 1932-1933 be solemnly remembered on its 60th anniversary;

(2) this anniversary underscores the hardship and inhumanity of life under the repressive regime of the Soviet Union during the Ukraine Famine of 1932-1933;

(3) the Congress condemns the systematic disregard for human life, human rights, and human liberty that characterized the policies of the Government of the Soviet Union during the Ukraine famine of 1932-1933;

(4) the presentation of a copy of the findings and conclusions of the Commission on the Ukraine Famine to the Government of Ukraine on September 10-12 by members of the Commission will assist in the dissemination of information about the Ukraine famine of 1932-1933, and thereby help to prevent similar future tragedies; and

(5) the manmade Ukraine famine is a graphic illustration of the unacceptable alternative to democracy and a free market economy, and therefore the United States should seek to help Ukraine and other newly independent states of the former Soviet Union as they transform their societies.

SEC. 2. TRANSMITTAL OF RESOLUTION.

The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit a copy of this resolution to the President

and the Secretary of State and request that the Secretary of State transmit a copy of the resolution to the Government of Ukraine.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, I rise to introduce a resolution to commemorate the Ukraine famine of 1932-33. Sixty years ago, the Soviet Union engineered one of the most horrific acts of genocide ever perpetrated. This brutal act committed against Ukraine must be recalled so we never forget its millions of victims. In introducing this resolution, I am joined by Senators DECONCINI, D'AMATO, BIDEN, and SARBANES.

As we mark the 60th anniversary of the Ukraine famine, it is important to recognize that the Soviet Government made no mistake. There was no blunder. Let it be absolutely clear: The Ukraine famine was perpetrated deliberately by Soviet totalitarian dictator Joseph Stalin. Within only a few short years, Moscow's policies of forced collectivization and grain seizures caused the deaths of more than 7 million people in Ukraine.

Following the famine, Stalin and his henchmen engaged in a widespread propaganda effort to deceive the world into believing that their horrible act never occurred. As a consequence, only during the last decade have scholars, with the assistance of eyewitness testimony and newly available transcripts, fully unearthed the real story concealed behind Communist-fabricated distortions.

Robert Conquest, in his moving volume on the Ukraine famine, "Harvest of Sorrow," states, "the task of the historian is a notoriously difficult one of trying to represent clearly and truly in a few hundred pages events which cover years of time and nations of men and women." The ambitious task of piecing together the details of the famine has required intensive research by a team dedicated to informing the world of the atrocities carried out under Stalin. For this reason, Congress established in 1984 the Commission on the Ukraine Famine to expand our knowledge of this event and inform the world of the slaughter of millions of Ukrainians during 1932-33.

For us to comprehend how 60 years can pass without revealing this massive terror to the world, it is necessary to understand the activities in which Stalin engaged to suppress the truth. For example, when Roman Terekhov, a former provincial secretary of the Ukraine, appealed for famine aid in 1932, Stalin not only threatened to fire him, but suggested that he "work in the Union of Writers where you would write fairy tales for idiots to read."

The Commission's report issued in 1988 thoroughly debunks the Stalinist falsehoods. It confirms that "Joseph Stalin and those around him committed genocide against Ukrainians" in an effort to repress the Ukrainian peasantry and suppress any Ukrainian ex-

pression of a cultural or political identity. "The Famine," the commission elaborated, "was not, as is often alleged, related to drought." In addition, the Commission found evidence of "attempts * * * made to prevent the starving from traveling to areas where food was available," exacerbating the calamity.

From September 10-12, 1993, members of the Commission that studied the Ukraine famine will travel to Kiev to present a copy of their findings to the Ukrainian Government. The attached resolution recognizes this important symbolic occurrence, while offering Congress an opportunity to express its support for Ukraine and other newly Independent States as they proceed along the difficult road to democracy and a market-based economy.

Mr. President, the world must never be allowed to forget the victims of the famine in Ukraine. Passage of this resolution would signify the sense of Congress that we must remember those who suffered at the hands of Stalin's repressive policies of collectivism while helping to prevent future acts of genocide from occurring. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

SENATE RESOLUTION 142—RELATING TO THE AMERICAN BUSINESS WOMEN'S ASSOCIATION

Mr. COVERDELL submitted the following resolution which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources:

S. RES. 142

Whereas the American Business Women's Association (hereafter referred to in this Resolution as the "Association") has been making tomorrow better for active and concerned women since 1949;

Whereas at that time, as today, the primary objective of the Association is to aid in the professional, educational, cultural, and social advancement of business women;

Whereas the national organization, founded in Kansas City, Missouri, is an influential organization with a membership exceeding 100,000 from all types of businesses and professions in more than 1,900 chapters in the United States and Puerto Rico;

Whereas the Atlanta Area Council, representing 37 chapters from across the metropolitan Atlanta area, has been a viable business organization;

Whereas the Association offers assistance to women aspiring to successful careers by investing in their education;

Whereas since the Association's inception, chapters have sponsored scholarships for women seeking to further their education;

Whereas the amount awarded annually by chapters has grown to more than \$2,000,000; and

Whereas for thousands of working women, the Association is a better way to advance in their education and in their business and personal lives; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate to recognize and commend the Association as it continues to communicate to individuals the importance of education and self-improvement of business women.

SENATE RESOLUTION 143—COMMEMORATING UNIVERSITY HOSPITAL IN AUGUSTA, GA

Mr. COVERDELL submitted the following resolution which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources:

S. RES. 143

Whereas in 1818, Augusta, Georgia, was a bustling trade town and opened the 10-bed "City Hospital" on the 100 block of Greene Street;

Whereas today the hospital is called "University Hospital" and is a 700-bed regional medical center with a staff of 3,000 health professionals;

Whereas Dr. Milton Antony began teaching apprentices at City Hospital in 1826 and founded the Medical Academy of Georgia (later renamed The Medical College of Georgia), Georgia's first medical school, in 1829 with 7 students;

Whereas in the mid-1800s, City Hospital treated thousands of patients during outbreaks of yellow fever and smallpox;

Whereas in 1854, Dr. Henry Campbell and Dr. Robert Campbell opened the Jackson Street Hospital and Surgical Infirmary to address the health needs of the black community in Augusta, which operated until the opening of Freedman's Hospital after the Civil War;

Whereas from 1862 to 1865, Augusta served as a major medical center for the Confederate Army;

Whereas by 1890, a population of over 33,000 was straining the capacity of City Hospital and Freedman's Hospital, and in 1893, City Hospital was expanded to make room for 100 beds for charity patients, 30 private beds, and an operating room and amphitheater where students could observe surgery;

Whereas in 1895, the 75-bed Lamar Hospital for blacks opened, with the assistance of Dr. William Doughty, the Augusta City Council, and the Gazeway B. Lamar estate;

Whereas the Augusta Training School for Nurses opened at City Hospital in 1894, which later combined with a training school for black nurses to form the integrated University Hospital School of Nursing in 1965;

Whereas in 1911, the Medical College of Georgia became a medical department of the University of Georgia, and the college's new teaching hospital was renamed University Hospital, and a new 275-bed hospital was dedicated on June 1, 1915;

Whereas the Eugene Talmadge Memorial Hospital opened on the campus of the Medical College of Georgia in 1956;

Whereas in 1962, the public approved a \$5,000,000 bond issue for a new University Hospital, and Federal matching funds were obtained after compliance with civil rights desegregation statutes, and a 10-story "ultra-modern" glass and metal structure was dedicated on April 16, 1971, in a nearby urban renewal tract known as "Frog Holler", with then Georgia Governor Jimmy Carter as guest speaker;

Whereas in 1975, the hospital authority acquired the services of a professional consulting firm to establish a 10-year strategic plan for the hospital, resulting in the construction of a professional office building in 1978 and an ambulatory care center in 1980;

Whereas sophisticated monitoring technology made open heart surgery a routine occurrence at the hospital by the late 1970s;

Whereas from 1980 to 1990, University Hospital implemented specialty centers such as the Jernigan Cancer Center, the Behavioral Health Center, the Women's Health Center,

and the Georgia Heart Institute, and cosponsored 3 ventures with St. Joseph Center for Life, the Resource Center on Aging, Walton Rehabilitation Hospital, and the Brandon Wilde Life Care Community;

Whereas the vision for the future of University Hospital includes exciting new additions, a new women's hospital, and other expanded services to meet the growing health care needs of our region; and

Whereas University Hospital continues to be dedicated to providing quality health care to all people at the lowest possible cost into the 21st century: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United States Senate recognizes the 175th year of operation of the University Hospital in Augusta, Georgia, and its commitment to meeting the health needs of the region with quality medical services.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH, CONSERVATION, FORESTRY, AND GENERAL LEGISLATION

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry Subcommittee on Agricultural Research, Conservation, Forestry, and General Legislation will hold a hearing on the use of water to control grain dust. The hearing will be held on Thursday, September 9, 1993, at 2:30 p.m. in SR-332.

For further information, please contact Richard Hess at 224-2321.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I would like to announce that a hearing has been scheduled before the Subcommittee on Public Lands, National Parks, and Forests.

The hearing will take place on Tuesday, September 14, 1993, beginning at 2:30 p.m. in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

The purpose of the hearing is to receive testimony from the Civil War Sites Advisory Commission on its report to the Congress on the Nation's Civil War battlefields.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, anyone wishing to submit a written statement is welcome to do so by sending two copies to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, 304 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510.

For further information regarding the hearing, please contact David Brooks of the subcommittee staff at (202) 224-8115.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I would like to announce that a hearing has been scheduled before the Subcommittee on Public Lands, National Parks, and Forests.

The hearing will take place on Tuesday, September 21, 1993, beginning at 2:30 p.m. in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

The purpose of the hearing is to receive testimony on the following bills currently pending before the subcommittee:

S. 986, to provide for an interpretive center at the Civil War Battlefield of Corinth, MS, and for other purposes;

S. 1033, to establish the Shenandoah Valley National Battlefields and Commission in the Commonwealth of Virginia, and for other purposes;

S. 1341, to establish the Wheeling National Heritage Area in the State of West Virginia, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 1305, to make boundary adjustments and other miscellaneous changes to authorities and programs of the National Park Service.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, anyone wishing to submit a written statement is welcome to do so by sending two copies to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, 304 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510.

For further information regarding the hearing, please contact David Brooks of the subcommittee staff at (202) 224-8115.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, September 7, 1993, at 2:30 p.m. to hold a hearing on fiscal year 1994 foreign assistance authorization: Russia aid.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet on Tuesday, September 7, 1993 at 10 A.M., in executive session, to receive a briefing on the Department of Defense bottom-up review.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF DETERMINATION BY THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON ETHICS UNDER RULE 35, PARAGRAPH 4, REGARDING EDUCATIONAL TRAVEL

• Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, it is required by paragraph 4 of rule 35 that I place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD notices of Senate employees who participate in programs, the principal objective of which is educational, sponsored by a foreign government or a foreign educational or charitable organization involving travel to a foreign country paid for by that foreign government or organization.

The select committee received notification under rule 35 for Cliff Palmer, a member of the staff of Senator JOHNSTON, to participate in a program in Taiwan, sponsored by Soochow University, from August 17-23, 1993.

The committee determined that no Federal statute or Senate rule would prohibit participation by Mr. Palmer in this program.

The select committee received notification under rule 35 for Sharon Waxman, a member of the staff of Senator LAUTENBERG, to participate in a program in Indonesia, sponsored by the Republic of Indonesia, from August 20 to September 5, 1993.

The committee determined that no Federal statute or Senate rule would prohibit participation by Ms. Waxman in this program.

The select committee received notification under rule 35 for Karen O'Callaghan, a member of the staff of Senator HELMS, to participate in a program in Korea, sponsored by the Korean Ministry of Foreign Affairs, from August 29 to September 4, 1993.

The committee determined that no Federal statute or Senate rule would prohibit participation by Ms. O'Callaghan in this program.

The select committee received notification under rule 35 for Carter Pilcher, a member of the staff of Senator BROWN, to participate in a program in Taiwan, sponsored by Soochow University, from August 17-23, 1993.

The committee determined that no Federal statute or Senate rule would prohibit participation by Mr. Pilcher in this program.

The select committee received notification under rule 35 for Katherine Brunett, a member of the staff of Senator SIMPSON, to participate in a program in Hong Kong and the People's Republic of China, sponsored by The Hong Kong General Chamber of Commerce, from August 30 to September 6, 1993.

The committee determined that no Federal statute or Senate rule would prohibit participation by Ms. Brunett in this program.

The select committee received notification under rule 35 for Senator SHELBY and Tom Young and Victoria Lee, members of the staff of Senator SHELBY, to participate in a program in China, sponsored by the Chinese People's Institute of Foreign Affairs, from August 11-25, 1993.

The committee determined that no Federal statute or Senate rule would prohibit participation by Senator SHELBY, Mr. Young and Ms. Lee in this program.

The select committee received notification under rule 35 for Mr. Harroz, a member of the staff of Senator BOREN, to participate in a program in Chile, sponsored by the Chilean-American Chamber of Commerce, from August 9-13, 1993.

The committee determined that no Federal statute or Senate rule would prohibit participation by Mr. Harroz in this program.

The select committee received notification under rule 35 for Amy Dunathan, a member of the staff of Senator CHAFEE, to participate in a program in Hong Kong and the People's Republic of China, sponsored by the Hong Kong General Chamber of Commerce from August 30 to September 6, 1993.

The committee determined that no Federal statute or Senate rule would prohibit participation by Ms. Dunathan in this program.●

COMMENDING JAMES A. RHINEBARGER AS CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL TROOPERS COALITION

● Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate the new chairman of the National Troopers Coalition, Indiana State Police Detective Sgt. James A. Rhinebarger. In June, the National Troopers Coalition, which represents 45,000 State Police and highway patrol troopers across the country, met in Kansas City, MO, to elect their new chairman.

Through his life's work as an Indiana State trooper, Detective Sergeant Rhinebarger exemplifies the tireless effort of law enforcement officials. These unsung heroes enable each of us to walk safely through our neighborhoods, sleep in our homes, and travel the interstate highways without threat of danger. As chairman of the National Troopers Coalition, Detective Sergeant Rhinebarger will provide leadership to these State Police and highway patrol troopers around the country.

The aim of the National Troopers Coalition is to assist States in law enforcement issues. This task is accomplished through educating members on national concerns which directly impact law enforcement. In addition, the National Troopers Coalition works in Washington, DC, to represent the voice of State Police and highway patrol troopers.

Detective Sergeant Rhinebarger is a 21-year veteran of the Indiana State Police. At present, he is assigned to the district 51 Pendleton installation.

In 1980 Detective Sergeant Rhinebarger was chosen by Hoosier law enforcement officers to serve as president of the Indiana State Police Alliance. This organization represents the officers and employees of Indiana's law enforcement agencies.

As president of the Indiana State Police Alliance Detective Sergeant Rhinebarger was instrumental in forming the Indiana State Police Alliance, Conservation, Excise Coalition.

He served as president of the Indiana State Police Alliance through 1988. In 1989, he joined the national executive board of the National Trooper Coal-

tion. He served as a board member until he was chosen as the chairman of that organization this year.

A native Hoosier, Detective Sergeant Rhinebarger was born in Kokomo, IN. He now resides in Arcadia, IN, with his wife of 31 years, Glenda. He has two grown children, Mark and Susan. In his spare time he enjoys riding his two horses.

Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing this public servant who has given of himself not only to the people of Indiana but to the entire country.●

HONORING THE VILLAGE OF PATCHOGUE

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I rise today to speak in celebration of the village of Patchogue on the occasion of their 100th anniversary of incorporation. On September 11 the village of Patchogue will enact a centennial festival which will begin with a parade through the business section of the village and culminate with a ceremony whereby honored guests will present proclamations to the village.

Patchogue was settled in 1750 by three families headed by Jonas Wickes, Humphrey Avery, and Lefford Leffords. Beginning as early as 1750, Patchogue achieved some of its greatest economic momentum through the many mills that were operated on the many local waterways. Through the years, dams were constructed on the several local streams, collectively establishing Patchogue as a leading industrial center. Some of Patchogue's early settlers operated grist mills, sawmills and other mills that produced such materials as paper, wool, carpet, twine and lace.

The Long Island Railroad figured prominently in Patchogue's growth when it arrived in 1869. The coming of the railroad enhanced Patchogue's prestige immensely.

In the 1870's Justus Roe invented steel tape measures when the 100-link chain he was using for surveying became tangled in underbrush. He got the idea from hoop skirts, which were popular at the time. Thus began Justus Roe & Sons, which is still in business today. At the same time, Patchogue's oyster industry made great strides and as an experiment a few of the luscious bivalves were sent to England, where a good market for oysters was found.

In 1887 Patchogue introduced the first electric street lights; the power for these street lights was derived from a dam in Patchogue Lake. In 1887, fewer than 300 communities coast-to-coast boasted electrically illuminated thoroughfares.

The idea of making Patchogue an incorporated village was first proposed in 1890, but the plan met defeat in referendum by a fairly close vote of 235-211. In 1893, the proposition was again put to a vote, this time being approved 268-202.

In the 1890's, Patchogue economy received a substantial boost with the opening of what was to eventually become the Patchogue-Plymouth Lace Mill. During World War II the mill began manufacturing such items as camouflage netting, millions of yards of herringbone twill used in GI fatigues, and produced waterproof covers and parachute material.

Over the years, the village boundaries were extended twice—on the west in 1927, and on the north in 1933, bringing the municipality to 2.2 square miles in size. The village government is conducted by a village board, consisting of a mayor and six trustees.

I am proud to represent Patchogue and villages like it. It is people like the good people of Patchogue who make up the very fiber of our American dream. I ask my colleagues to recognize the value of Patchogue and celebrate the ability of this incorporated village to bloom and prosper over a century of change. I salute the residents of Patchogue, and congratulate each of you on your 100th anniversary. Congratulations and best wishes for continued prosperity.●

CONGRATULATIONS TO AOPA

● Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to commend a valued constituent organization, the American Orthotic and Prosthetic Association [AOPA], for receiving an honorable mention from the National Rehabilitation Week awards committee.

AOPA was nominated for the award by Creighton J. Hale, president and CEO of little league baseball, for its efforts to raise funds for little league's challenger division. Each year AOPA holds a charity golf tournament to benefit the division, which provides the opportunity for mentally and physically challenged children to play baseball.

The national awards program was established to honor individuals and organizations for their work on behalf of people with disabilities. AOPA is a national membership organization which represents more than 800 allied health care provider firms who provide services to individuals with physical disabilities throughout the United States. Orthotic and prosthetic practitioners employed by AOPA member firms design and fit orthoses (braces) and prostheses (artificial limbs) which enable physically challenged individuals to overcome significant orthopedic conditions and serious injuries and return to active productive lives.

AOPA will be recognized for its outstanding achievements in the world of disability at an awards dinner September 23 in Scranton, PA. National Rehabilitation Week is September 19-25, 1993.

AOPA will hold its fifth annual charity golf tournament to benefit challenger little league baseball February

3-6, 1994, at the Orange Tree Golf and Conference Resort in Scottsdale, AZ. This is just one of the many activities AOPA is working on to improve the lives of the physically challenged of all ages.●

FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION AGENCY—S. 1349

● Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, the bill which Senator DURENBERGER has introduced, and which I am an original co-sponsor, will do much to correct many of the problems which plague our current food safety system. The people in my State of Washington have a vested interest in the success of this legislation because several months ago, an *E. coli* epidemic brought personal tragedy to families across Washington State—killing three children and sickening hundreds. This tragedy brought to light the inadequacies which plague our current food safety system, and the lack of sound research which is needed to answer the most basic of questions about this deadly bacteria.

It took a tragedy to deliver a wake up call to the entire Nation on the inadequacies which plague our Nation's food safety system and this bill will do much to answer that call. S. 1349 would establish a single Food Safety and Inspection Agency. Specifically, the bill will consolidate the food safety and inspection functions of the Department of Agriculture, the Food and Drug Administration, the Commerce Department, and the Environmental Protection Agency into one Food Safety and Inspection Agency. This consolidation will do much to end the seemingly endless overlap of Federal agency jurisdiction and also reform our food safety system—a system which has not been overhauled since its inception in 1906.

Earlier this year when the USDA held a public hearing on food safety reform in Seattle, WA, and at that time I discussed this legislation with the families of *E. coli* victims and asked the families to take a closer look at the bill and give me their recommendation as to whether or not I should endorse the measure. These are the families, Mr. President, whose lives have been impacted first hand by the problems plaguing our current food safety system. These are the families who have courageously come forward to share their personal tragedy with others. The families have expressed their support for the measure and that is, in large part, why I am an original co-sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. President, I hope that Members of Congress will follow the courageous example set by the families of *E. coli* victims in my State and take the appropriate steps to enact this bill into law. This bill makes sense. It eliminates another layer of bureaucracy from a government which appears to be growing out of control—an outcome of which can only be good.

I understand that included within Vice President GORE's National Performance Review Board recommendations on reinventing Government includes a provision which would consolidate the food safety inspection and regulatory jurisdictions of USDA and Commerce with the FDA. Although this consolidation differs from that which S. 1349 advocates, it is still a step in the right direction.

Senator DURENBERGER and I hope to work closely with affected agencies, the Vice President, and other Senators to pass this important legislation.

Mr. President, passage of this legislation would truly be reinventing Government, and more importantly help to restore the faith of many Americans in a food safety system which is in dire need of repair.●

THE RETIREMENT OF WENDY STEPHENS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

● Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, the successes of our national institutions have always relied on the contributions of individuals who have the imagination to innovate, and the ability to carry through to serve the public. I pause today to join millions of visitors who annually flock to the Smithsonian Institution's National Air and Space Museum, to pay tribute to one who has enriched the lives of so many citizens of all ages.

Wendy Stephens, daughter of Sy and Geraldine Ackerman, was born in Queens, NY, on June 21, 1954. She first joined the staff of the Smithsonian Institution and the National Air and Space Museum in 1974, working on the floor of the museum's gift shops while still in college at American University. After graduation, in 1975, she rejoined the museum, and when a vacancy in the gift shop manager's position developed, she was asked to take over. The quality of her budget preparations and projections came to the attention of the museum's deputy, who asked her to become responsible for the entire museum budget.

Ten years after first joining the museum, Wendy was appointed the museum's administrative officer, and after a long search that saw applications from well over a hundred candidates, she became the museum's associate director in 1989, a position in which she served as the museum's chief operating officer. Recently, after nearly 18 years with the Institution, she was named deputy to the museum's director.

Last year, before the opening of the museum's Star Trek gallery, unusually large numbers of visitor inquiries suggested that enthusiastic crowds would pose a problem by overfilling the gallery. Just days before the scheduled opening, Wendy devised a system of free passes, to be handed out first thing each morning and timed to let only 50

visitors into the gallery each quarter-hour. Then she searched widely for volunteers to administer this system, and attracted 300 enthusiastic aides who tirelessly took turns for over 11 months, making sure that visitors had a great time despite the huge demand. Nearly 900,000 members of the public got to see the show in that fashion, the most popular offering the Smithsonian ever provided. When it was all over, Wendy found a way to arrange a thank-you party for all volunteers, complete with Star Trek stars, who were pleased to fly in from Hollywood for the occasion. It was a smashing success.

I was sorry to learn that Wendy recently left the Smithsonian Institution and the Washington, DC, area. She, her husband Chris and young son Garrett, have relocated to Florida. We all wish her and her family well, as they take up a new life in another part of the country. The museum and the millions of visitors who never knew her, will miss her; but I am certain that others at our great Smithsonian Institution will carry on, in her spirit and in her footsteps.●

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 1993

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until 9 a.m., Wednesday, September 8; that following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be deemed approved to date; that the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that there then be a period for morning business, not to extend beyond 9:30 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 5 minutes each, with the time from 9 to 9:30 a.m., under the control of the majority leader or his designee; that at 9:30 a.m., the Senate resume consideration of S. 1298, the Department of Defense authorization bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I have a unanimous-consent request which I am advised has been cleared on both sides.

Accordingly, pursuant to my earlier statement, I now ask unanimous consent that at 1 p.m. on Wednesday, September 8, the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report accompanying H.R. 2010, the National and Community Service Trust Act; that there be 3 hours for debate on the conference report, with the time to be equally divided and controlled between Senators KENNEDY and KASSEBAUM or their designees; that when all time is used or yielded back, the Senate, without intervening action or debate, vote on adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues for their courtesy.

I restate what I earlier said for the information of Senators. We will be on the DOD bill this evening and tomorrow morning until 1 o'clock, at which time we will interrupt to take up the national service bill. On or before 4 p.m. tomorrow, depending upon whether all of the 3 hours is used, we will vote on the national service conference report, and then we will return to consideration of the DOD bill. There may well be votes in the morning on the DOD authorization bill prior to the time we get to the national service bill.

Further, since it is my intention that the Senate remain in session this week until we complete action on the DOD bill, Senators should expect a lengthy session tomorrow and Thursday so that we can be in a position to complete action on this bill by Friday.

I thank the distinguished chairman for his cooperation.

I yield the floor.

Mr. NUNN. I thank the majority leader.

I might add one point. The majority leader said that we would perhaps be voting tomorrow morning. I think it is almost certain we will have a vote tomorrow morning. I would guess somewhere no earlier than 10:30, but probably no later than 11:30, somewhere in that timeframe.

PROGRAM

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I would like, if I might, to inform the Members of the Senate of the schedule for the remainder of this week so that Senators may make their plans accordingly.

We have just begun consideration of the DOD authorization bill. It is my intention that we proceed on this matter and complete action on it this week. That will mean lengthy sessions tomorrow and on Thursday, and most likely during the day on Friday. Senators should be aware of that in preparing their schedules for the remainder of this week.

We have been engaged in discussions throughout the day on proceeding to and completing action on the national service conference report. We want to accommodate our colleagues on the Republican side in that respect, and my expectation is we will shortly have an agreement that will permit us to take it up during the day tomorrow under a time limitation, and then vote on that tomorrow, interrupting the DOD authorization bill.

We will stay in until we complete action on the DOD authorization bill this week. I hope that can be a reasonable hour on Friday. It is then my intention that the Senate will proceed on Mon-

day to the Interior appropriations bill. That is the subject of a prior agreement that is printed at page 2 in today's calendar. As Senators will note, there are a large number of amendments listed to that, and I have asked the staffs to begin work on those, working with Senators who have amendments, so we can complete action on that bill next week prior to the break in observance of the Rosh Hashanah holiday.

In view of the fact that we have just begun on the DOD authorization bill, there will be opening statements to make, with managers working to organize amendments for tomorrow. There will be no further rollcall votes this evening.

Mr. President, I thank my colleagues for their cooperation. I know the managers are present. I inquire of the distinguished chairman whether he is ready to proceed with the bill at this time.

Mr. President, I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS UNTIL 9 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate today, I now ask unanimous consent the Senate stand in recess as previously ordered.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 8 p.m., recessed until Wednesday, September 8, 1993, at 9 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 7, 1993:

PEACE CORPS

CAROL BELLAMY, OF NEW YORK, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE PEACE CORPS. VICE ELAINE L. CHAO, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ALAN JOHN BLINKEN, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO BELGIUM.

PARKER W. BORG, OF MINNESOTA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF ICELAND.

U.S. INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

MARGARET V. W. CARPENTER, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR OF THE AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT. VICE REGINALD J. BROWN, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

EDWARD P. DJEREJIAN, OF MARYLAND, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO ISRAEL.

TOBI TRISTER GATI, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE. VICE DOUGLAS P. MULHOLLAND, RESIGNED.

U.S. INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

GORDON D. GIFFIN, OF GEORGIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 17, 1993. VICE EVAN GRIFFITH GALBRAITH, TERM EXPIRED.

GORDON D. GIFFIN, OF GEORGIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 17, 1996. (REAPPOINTMENT)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

SWANEE GRACE HUNT, OF COLORADO, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF AUSTRIA.

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

CAROL J. LANCASTER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR OF THE AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT. VICE MARK L. EDELMAN, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

THOMAS A. LOFTUS, OF WISCONSIN, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO NORWAY.

THOMAS MICHAEL TOLLIVER NILES, OF KENTUCKY, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO GREECE.

EDWARD JOSEPH PERKINS, OF OREGON, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO AUSTRALIA.

WILLIAM LACY SWING, OF NORTH CAROLINA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF HAITI.

RICHARD W. TEARE, OF OHIO, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO PAPUA NEW GUINEA AND TO SERVE CONCURRENTLY AND WITHOUT ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION AS AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO SOLOMON ISLANDS AND AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF VANUATU.

ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

LINDA TSAO YANG, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE U.S. DIRECTOR OF THE ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR. VICE VICTOR H. FRANK, JR., RESIGNED.

U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY

MARIAN C. BENNETT, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL, UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY. VICE GEORGE F. MURPHY, JR., RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

DAVID J. BARRAM, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF COMMERCE. VICE ROCKWELL ANTHONY SCHNABEL, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

STEVEN O. PALMER, OF MICHIGAN, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION. VICE MICHAEL JAMES TOOHEY.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

EUGENE A. BRICKHOUSE, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS (HUMAN RESOURCES AND ADMINISTRATION). VICE RONALD E. RAY, RESIGNED.

THE JUDICIARY

HERBERT L. CHABOT, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE U.S. TAX COURT FOR A TERM EXPIRING 15 YEARS AFTER HE TAKES OFFICE. (REAPPOINTMENT)

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

JOSEPH A. DEAR, OF WASHINGTON, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF LABOR. VICE GERALD F. SCANNELL, RESIGNED.

MARTIN JOHN MANLEY, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF LABOR. VICE ROBERT MICHAEL GUTTMAN, RESIGNED.

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

EDNA FAIRBANKS-WILLIAMS, OF VERMONT, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION FOR THE TERM EXPIRING JULY 13, 1996. VICE JEANINE E. WOLBECK.

ERNESTINE P. WATLINGTON, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION FOR THE TERM EXPIRING JULY 13, 1996. VICE GEORGE W. WITTFRAF.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

NEAL F. LANE, OF OKLAHOMA, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION FOR A TERM OF SIX YEARS, VICE WALTER E. MASSEY, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

DONALD RICHARD WURTZ, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, VICE WILLIAM DEAN HANSEN, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

DANIEL A. DREYFUS, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF CIVILIAN RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, VICE JOHN WESLEY BARTLETT, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

WILLIAM J. GILMARTIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, VICE RUSSELL K. PAUL, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

EDUARDO GONZALEZ, OF FLORIDA, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE U.S. MARSHALS SERVICE, VICE HENRY EDWARD HUDSON, RESIGNED.

JO ANN HARRIS, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL, VICE ROBERT S. MUELLER, III, RESIGNED.

DAVID M. BARASCH, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE U.S. ATTORNEY FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA FOR THE TERM OF 4 YEARS VICE DAVID DART QUEEN, RESIGNED.

VERONICA FREEMAN COLEMAN, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE U.S. ATTORNEY FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE FOR THE TERM OF 4 YEARS VICE EDWARD G. BRYANT, RESIGNED.

EDWARD L. DOWD, JR., OF MISSOURI, TO BE U.S. ATTORNEY FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI FOR THE TERM OF 4 YEARS VICE STEPHEN B. HIGGINS.

HELEN FRANCES FAHEY, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE U.S. ATTORNEY FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA FOR THE TERM OF 4 YEARS VICE RICHARD CULLEN, RESIGNED.

CLAUDE HARRIS, JR., OF ALABAMA, TO BE U.S. ATTORNEY FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ALABAMA FOR THE TERM OF 4 YEARS VICE JACK W. SELDEN.

KATHRYN E. LANDRETH, OF NEVADA, TO BE U.S. ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA FOR THE TERM OF 4 YEARS VICE WILLIAM A. MADDOX, RESIGNED.

JAY PATRICK MCCLOSKEY, OF MAINE, TO BE U.S. ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF MAINE FOR THE TERM OF 4 YEARS VICE RICHARD S. COHEN, RESIGNED.

BETTY HANSEN RICHARDSON, OF IDAHO, TO BE U.S. ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF IDAHO FOR THE TERM OF 4 YEARS VICE MAURICE O. ELLSWORTH.

EDMUND A. SARGUS, JR., OF OHIO, TO BE U.S. ATTORNEY FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO FOR THE TERM OF 4 YEARS VICE D. MICHAEL CRITES, RESIGNED.

HENRY LAWRENCE SOLANO, OF COLORADO, TO BE U.S. ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO FOR THE TERM OF 4 YEARS VICE MICHAEL J. NORTON, RESIGNED.

ASSASSINATION RECORDS REVIEW BOARD

KERMIT L. HALL, OF OKLAHOMA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE ASSASSINATION RECORDS REVIEW BOARD. (NEW POSITION)

JOHN R. TUNHEIM, OF MINNESOTA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE ASSASSINATION RECORDS REVIEW BOARD. (NEW POSITION)

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

R. NOEL LONGUEMARE, JR., OF MARYLAND, TO BE DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR ACQUISITION, VICE DONALD C. FRASER, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

DORIS MEISSNER, OF MARYLAND, TO BE COMMISSIONER OF IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION, VICE GENE MCNARY, RESIGNED.

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING REGULAR OFFICERS OF THE U.S. COAST GUARD FOR PROMOTION TO THE GRADE OF CAPTAIN:

MALCOLM D. STEVENS
JAMES L. ROHN
WILLIAM M. BANNISTER
ROBERT F. DUNCAN
KEVIN J. SCHEID
JEFFREY A. HILL
MERRITT H. AURICH, IV
DENNIS A. SANDE
JOSEPH A. WALKER, JR.
DONALD S. GILBERT
RICHARD E. BENNIS
STEPHEN R. CAMPBELL
WILLIAM J. MORANI, JR.
WAYNE K. GIBSON
CLIFFORD I. PEARSON
WILLIAM R. ASHFORTH
MICHAEL L. BEATTY
LARRY L. MIZELL
WAYNE R. HAMILTON
RICHARD K. SOFTYE
JAMES A. RAUCH
WILLIAM D. KLINE

PHILIP P. WIECZYNSKI
STEVEN E. FROELICH
MICHAEL D. HATHAWAY
DEAN L. HARDER
MICHAEL W. RAGSDALE
JOHN M. GRAY, III
THOMAS C. PAAR
HAROLD E. BLANEY, JR.
PAUL J. HOWARD
TERRY L. RICE
ROBERT B. HURWITT
SCOTT P. COOPER
MARK R. MAYNE
ROGER G. EVANS
CHRISTIAN T. BOHNER
THOMAS A. TROSVIG
DAVID B. PETERMAN
DAVID W. KUNKEL
WILLIAM M. HAYES
JOHNNY F. BURELL
DALE E. GOODREAU
WILLIAM W. SPITLER

BRUCE J. GOOD
DENNIS G. BOHLAYER

DANIEL J. FARRELL
JEFFREY J. HATHAWAY

THE FOLLOWING REGULAR OFFICER OF THE PERMANENT COMMISSIONED TEACHING STAFF, COAST GUARD ACADEMY, U.S. COAST GUARD FOR PROMOTION TO THE GRADE OF CAPTAIN:

JOSEPH B. EGAN

THE FOLLOWING REGULAR OFFICERS OF THE PERMANENT COMMISSIONED TEACHING STAFF, COAST GUARD ACADEMY, U.S. COAST GUARD FOR PROMOTION TO THE GRADE OF CAPTAIN:

BRUCE R. MUSTAIN

RICHARD B. GAINS

THE FOLLOWING REGULAR AND RESERVE OFFICERS OF THE U.S. COAST GUARD TO BE PERMANENT COMMISSIONED OFFICERS IN THE GRADES INDICATED:

To be lieutenant commander

DAVID A. KIRETA

To be lieutenant

PATRICIA R. SPIVEY
ROBERT E. STYRON
GERARDO MORGAN
MICHAEL Z. ERNESTO
RODERICK D. DAVIS
JASON L. TENGAN
RICHARD D. PERKEL
STEVEN A. MATTHEWS
CARMELO S. BAZZANO

MICHAEL G. CALLAHAN
RICHARD A. WILLIAMS
MONT E. MCMILLEN, III
EDWARD M. HAYES
BRUCE C. FISHER
JEFFREY D. KOTSON
WARD G. PARKER
JESSE R. BURSON
PATRICK M. GORMAN

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. CHARLES E. FRANKLIN xxx-xx-xxxx U.S. AIR FORCE.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER TO BE PLACED ON THE RETIRED LIST IN THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 1370:

To be general

GEN. COLIN L. POWELL xxx-xx-x. U.S. ARMY.

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 152, FOR APPOINTMENT AS CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF AND REAPPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF GENERAL WHILE SERVING IN THAT POSITION:

*To be general**To be chairman of the joint chiefs of staff*

GEN. JOHN M. SHALIKASHVILI xxx-xx-x. U.S. ARMY.

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED MEDICAL CORPS OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE GRADE OF BRIGADIER GENERAL UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTIONS 61(A) AND 624(C):

To be permanent brigadier general

COL. ROBERT G. CLAYPOOL xxx-xx-x.
COL. JOHN S. PARKER xxx-xx-x.

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE GRADE OF BRIGADIER GENERAL UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTIONS 61(A) AND 624(C):

To be permanent brigadier general

COL. WALTER B. HUFFMAN xxx-xx-x.
COL. JOHN S. COOKE xxx-xx-x.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED UNITED STATES ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OFFICER FOR PROMOTION TO THE GRADE OF BRIGADIER GENERAL IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTIONS 593(A) AND 3385:

To be brigadier general

COL. WILLIAM C. BILD xxx-xx-xxxx ARMY NATIONAL GUARD.

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER TO BE PLACED ON THE RETIRED LIST IN THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 1370:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. MICHAEL C. COLLEY, U.S. NAVY xxx-xx-x.

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED REAR ADMIRAL (LOWER HALF) IN THE COMPETITIVE CATEGORY OF SPECIAL DUTY OFFICER (INTELLIGENCE) OF THE NAVY FOR PROMOTION TO THE PERMANENT GRADE OF REAR ADMIRAL, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 624, SUBJECT TO QUALIFICATIONS THEREFOR AS PROVIDED BY LAW:

Special duty officer (intelligence)

To be rear admiral

RADM(LH) MICHAEL WILLIAM CRAMER, U.S. NAVY. xxx-xx-x.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR PERMANENT PROMOTION IN THE U.S. AIR FORCE, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 628, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, AS AMENDED, WITH DATE OF RANK TO BE DETERMINED BY THE SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE.

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

To be colonel

DWYER FRANCIS J. xxx-xx-x.
WEIDMER THERON E. xxx-xx-x.

To be lieutenant colonel

COCKER MICHAEL F. xxx-xx-x.
KEARNS JOHN A. xxx-xx-x.
PHELPS PAUL K. xxx-xx-x.
RAMSEY FREDERICK M. xxx-xx-x.
STOUDER KYLE xxx-xx-x.
SUBER WILLIAM V. xxx-xx-x.
THOMPSON ROBERT H. xxx-xx-x.
WALKER MORRIS E. xxx-xx-x.

To be major

BRUNSKOLE STEVEN E. xxx-xx-x.
PEREZ DENNIS R. xxx-xx-x.
REIMANN JACK L. xxx-xx-x.
SANFORD RICKY W. xxx-xx-x.
WIGGS THOMAS R. xxx-xx-x.

BIOMEDICAL SCIENCES CORPS

To be colonel

HOWELL JAMES F. xxx-xx-x.

To be major

HILOVSKY JEFFREY F. xxx-xx-x.

NURSE CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

BIERMAN GAIL D. xxx-xx-x.
LEWIS ELLEN N. xxx-xx-x.

To be major

CRAW SUSAN J. xxx-xx-x.

THE FOLLOWING INDIVIDUALS FOR RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE APPOINTMENT, IN THE GRADE INDICATED, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 593, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, WITH A VIEW TO DESIGNATION UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 8067, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, TO PERFORM THE DUTIES INDICATED.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonel

MARSH, BYRON P. xxx-xx-x.

To be lieutenant colonel

HARPER, PAUL J. xxx-xx-x.
KLEIN, MICHAEL R. xxx-xx-x.
MATTISON, RICHARD C. xxx-xx-x.
RIVERO, WEIMAR xxx-xx-x.
SAUNDER, ROBERT J. xxx-xx-x.
STEINWAY, DAVID M. xxx-xx-x.
SULLIVAN, JOAN xxx-xx-x.
WILSON, MICHAEL H. xxx-xx-x.

DENTAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

CHILES, DONALD G. xxx-xx-x.

THE FOLLOWING REGULAR OFFICERS FOR RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE APPOINTMENT, IN THE GRADE INDICATED, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 593, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE.

LINE

To be lieutenant colonel

FLYNT, GARY H. xxx-xx-x.
KAHOE, JOSEPH J. xxx-xx-x.
KEATING, PATRICK N. xxx-xx-x.
LIBAIRE, JEFFREY L. xxx-xx-x.
MACKAY, JOHN D. xxx-xx-x.
NUNNALLEE, JAMES B. xxx-xx-x.
OXFORD, VAYL S. xxx-xx-x.
WESTFALL, RONALD L. xxx-xx-x.

THE FOLLOWING PERSON FOR RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE APPOINTMENT, IN THE GRADE INDICATED, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 593, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE.

RETIRED RESERVE

To be lieutenant colonel

HENDERSON, JAMES xxx-xx-x.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS, ON THE ACTIVE DUTY LIST, FOR PROMOTION TO THE GRADE INDICATED

IN THE U.S. ARMY IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTIONS 624 AND 628, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE. THE OFFICER IDENTIFIED WITH AN ASTERISK IS ALSO BEING NOMINATED FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 531, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE.

ARMY

To be lieutenant colonel

RONALD D. LEWIS, 8518

ARMY

To be major

ANITA L. BAKER xx...
LYNN N. BOWLER xx...
JAMES M. GUTIERREZ xx...
DAVID B. JASON xx...
MARK S. KUEHL xx...
*MICHAEL A. NORRUS xx...

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED COMMANDERS IN THE LINE OF THE NAVY FOR PROMOTION TO THE PERMANENT GRADE OF CAPTAIN, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 624, SUBJECT TO QUALIFICATIONS THEREFOR AS PROVIDED BY LAW:

UNRESTRICTED LINE OFFICERS

To be captain

BOOSE, MARION SANFORD, JR.,
CHANIK, EVAN MARTIN, JR.
MAIN, GLENN ALLAN
MCCORT, DANIEL RALPH
MILLER, DAVID ROSS
NELSON, JEFFREY ROBERT
PHILLIPS, JAMES WILLIAM
STAPLEFORD, JAMES
RANDALL
ZIMMERMAN, KENNETH
RONALD

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED COMMANDER IN THE LINE OF THE NAVY FOR PROMOTION TO THE PERMANENT GRADE OF CAPTAIN, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 624, SUBJECT TO QUALIFICATIONS THEREFOR AS PROVIDED BY LAW:

UNRESTRICTED LINE OFFICER

*To be captain*WILLIAMS, THOMAS
RICHARD, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED COMMANDERS OF THE RESERVE OF THE U.S. NAVY FOR PERMANENT PROMOTION TO THE GRADE OF CAPTAIN IN THE LINE, IN THE COMPETITIVE CATEGORY AS INDICATED, PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 5912:

UNRESTRICTED LINE OFFICERS

To be captain

AXTELL, STEPHEN P.
BENEFIELD, ROBERT
BRAND
BOYD, JAMES ALEXANDER
BROWN, JEFFREY CHARLES
CAMPBELL, ROSS GOODWIN
EVERSON, JOHN EVERETT
FORREST, BENJAMIN
FRANKLIN
GRAHAM, DAVID JOSEPH
GUNDERSON, ROBERT KENT
JAMES, JOHN WELLS, IV
SANWICK, PAUL
BAINBRIDGE, JR.
WRIGHT, THOMAS EDWIN
JR.

UNRESTRICTED LINE OFFICER (TAR)

(TRAINING AND ADMINISTRATION OF RESERVE)

*To be captain*ASKEY, CHARLES
BENJAMIN

SPECIAL DUTY OFFICER (MERCHANT MARINE)

*To be captain*STAPLETON, THOMAS
MACPHERSON

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS IN THE LINE OF THE NAVY FOR PROMOTION TO THE PERMANENT GRADE OF COMMANDER, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 624, SUBJECT TO QUALIFICATIONS THEREFOR AS PROVIDED BY LAW:

UNRESTRICTED LINE OFFICERS

To be commander

ALBERT, STEVEN PATRICK
BENNETT, BRIAN EUGENE
BOENSEL, MARK STEPHEN
BUSS, DAVID H.
DICKMAN, JEFFREY KENT
DUGENE, JOHN T.
GRANDFIELD, PHILIP W.
GRATAS, ARTHUR
NICHOLAS
HNARAKIS, ALEXANDER
BRUCE
KLAPKA, EDWARD J., JR.
LEAVER, JASON A.
MATHEWS, JEROME JAY
PASZTALANIEC, MATTHEW
SCOTT
PAYNE, RICHARD HAROLD
PONTES, LEE NMN
SKELTON, CLIFFORD
ARTHUR
SOWELL, ROBERT S.
STEWART, RICHARD GLENN
THOMPSON, GEORGE
WESLEY, JR.
WARFIELD, WILLARD
RICHARD
WEBER, PHILIP DURANT

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS OF THE RESERVE OF THE U.S. NAVY FOR PERMANENT PROMOTION TO THE GRADE OF COMMANDER IN THE LINE, IN THE COMPETITIVE CATEGORY AS INDICATED, PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 5912:

UNRESTRICTED LINE OFFICERS

To be commander

BAUER, THOMAS E.
BEATTIE, GEORGE TAYLOR, JR.
CHITTENDEN, DONALD
EDWARD
GULLEY, ROBERT BRACY
HASSLER, CHRISTOPHER
CONRAD
KING, JEFFREY PAUL
LILLY, SALE TRICE
MORISSETTE, GARRY GENE
RUDOLPH, ROBERT
HAWARD
SWILLEY, WAYMAN OWEN, JR.
UCHIDA, RICHARD TAD

UNRESTRICTED LINE OFFICER (TAR)
(TRAINING AND ADMINISTRATION OF RESERVE)*To be commander*

OWEN, DONALD K.

SPECIAL DUTY OFFICER (INTELLIGENCE)

To be commander

BRYNESTAD, SUSAN MARIE

SPECIAL DUTY OFFICER (MERCHANT MARINE)

To be commander

SIDELINGER, GARY ALLEN

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS IN THE STAFF CORPS OF THE NAVY FOR PROMOTION TO THE PERMANENT GRADE OF COMMANDER, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 624, SUBJECT TO QUALIFICATIONS THEREFOR AS PROVIDED BY LAW:

MEDICAL CORPS OFFICERS

*To be commander*BAILEY, DEAN ALAN
BALSARA, ZUBIN NARI
MEHALEK, KAREN E.

SUPPLY CORPS OFFICERS

*To be commander*ROARK, DOUGLAS SCOTT
THORNTON, CONNIE LOU

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS OFFICER

To be commander

MONROY, RODNEY LYNN

NURSE CORPS OFFICER

To be commander

COULAPIDES, DEBORA ANN

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS IN THE LINE OF THE NAVY FOR PROMOTION TO THE PERMANENT GRADE OF COMMANDER, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 624, SUBJECT TO QUALIFICATIONS THEREFOR AS PROVIDED BY LAW:

UNRESTRICTED LINE OFFICERS

*To be commander*LYNCH, JOSEPH MICHAEL
WILCOX, WILLIAM GEORGE, JR.

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS OF THE RESERVE OF THE U.S. NAVY FOR PROMOTION TO THE PERMANENT GRADE OF COMMANDER IN THE STAFF CORPS, IN THE COMPETITIVE CATEGORY AS INDICATED, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 5912:

MEDICAL CORPS OFFICERS

*To be commander*CLARK, DAVID A.
SPEIDEL, FRANCIS XAVIER

NURSE CORPS OFFICERS

*To be commander*BUTLER, EILEEN
MARGARET
KUTNER, JEANETTE
LENAHAN, LINDA M.

SUPPLY CORPS OFFICER

To be commander

KANE, RICHARD P.

CHAPLAIN CORPS OFFICER

*To be commander*FRANCIS, DONALD
SPENCER

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED LIEUTENANTS IN THE LINE OF THE NAVY FOR PROMOTION TO THE PERMANENT GRADE OF LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 624, SUBJECT TO QUALIFICATIONS THEREFOR AS PROVIDED BY LAW:

UNRESTRICTED LINE OFFICER

To be lieutenant commander

CROSBY, MICHAEL ANDREW
DIAMOND, STEVEN
MICHAEL
FLANAGAN, JOHN FRANCIS
GARCIA, MARK ANTHONY
JOHN
GOLDFINGER, JEFFREY
SCOTT
GRAHAM, JOHN KEITH
JOHNSON, MARC JAY
KNIGHT, RUSSELL PAUL
NAGLE, ANDREW OWENS

PAWLOWSKI, FREDRICK
DONALD J.
POSTERA, RICHARD JAMES
RUCKER, TERRY LYNN
THOMAS, JEFFREY
NEILSON
WOLFE, ROBERT JOHN
YATES, PHILIP ARTHUR

LIMITED DUTY OFFICER (LINE)

*To be lieutenant commander*MICHANOWICZ, ANTHONY
MICHAEL

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED LIEUTENANTS IN THE LINE OF THE NAVY FOR PROMOTION TO THE PERMANENT GRADE OF LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 624, SUBJECT TO QUALIFICATIONS THEREFOR AS PROVIDED BY LAW:

UNRESTRICTED LINE OFFICERS

*To be lieutenant commander*ANDERSON, CHARLES
SCOTT
CRAIN, PAUL DANIEL
NEWMAN, ROBERT DEAN
NICHOLS, JEFFREY
DONALD

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED LIEUTENANT IN THE STAFF CORPS OF THE NAVY FOR PROMOTION TO THE PERMANENT GRADE OF LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 624, SUBJECT TO QUALIFICATIONS THEREFOR AS PROVIDED BY LAW:

MEDICAL CORPS OFFICER

To be lieutenant commander

PERRY, LORING ISAAC

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED LIEUTENANTS IN THE STAFF CORPS OF THE NAVY FOR PROMOTION TO THE PERMANENT GRADE OF LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 624, SUBJECT TO QUALIFICATIONS THEREFOR AS PROVIDED BY LAW:

MEDICAL CORPS OFFICERS

To be lieutenant commander

BIBLE, MONTE L.
DELTERZO, MICHAEL, A.
DZIEDZIC, STANLEY F.
FARRELL, TIMOTHY, P.
FOX, DANIEL R.
FREMING, BRET G.
GIEDRAITIS, ROBERT B.
GROESBECK, PHILIP D.
HARRISON, KENNETH
HIPSKIND, JOHN E.
KABLE, MICHAEL S.
KARP, MICHAEL W.
LUCERO, JOSEPH W.
MARCHIANDO, THOMAS E.
MCKENNA, GEORGE J.
NARD, JEFFREY H.
PAPALEKAS, PANO L.
PENROSE, JAMES R.
PETERSON, BOBBY D.
PILE, JAMES C.
SCHRUNK, KEVIN FRANCIS
SCHWARTZ, FRANCIS X., JR.
VOLCHECK, GERALD
WAYNE
WALLER, BENJAMIN R.
WALTER, LAWRENCE E.

DENTAL CORPS OFFICERS

*To be lieutenant commander*CLARK, JAY A.
GROSS, GARY THOMAS
OLSEN, BARNEY T.
TRENTLEY, WILLIAM
MICHAEL

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS OFFICERS

*To be lieutenant commander*FRYAUFF, DAVID JEFFREY
HOELSCHER, JOHN HENRY
HUFFMAN, ELIZABETH ANN

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS, ON THE ACTIVE DUTY LIST, FOR PROMOTION TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 624, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE. THE OFFICERS INDICATED BY ASTERISK ARE ALSO NOMINATED FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 531, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE:

DENTAL

To be major

ERROL J. * ALLISON xxx-xx-x...
STEVEN P. * BLAHA xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM T. * BURNS xxx-xx-x...
MIKE W. * CHOE xxx-xx-x...
JOSE J. * CONDE xxx-xx-x...
FURMAN K. * COPE xxx-xx-x...
PAUL L. * COREN xxx-xx-x...
ALEXANDER K. * DEBATE xxx-xx-x...
JOSE D. * DOMINGUEZ xxx-xx-x...
DAVID K. * FIASCHETTI xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT G. * GLASS xxx-xx-x...
MARK L. * GONSEWART xxx-xx-x...
JULIO * GONZALES, III xxx-xx-x...
STEVEN M. * GRODDY xxx-xx-x...
WALTER A. * HENRY xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT L. * HOLMES xxx-xx-x...
JOHN S. * KITZMILLER xxx-xx-x...
JOSEPH S. * KROBOCK xxx-xx-x...
KIM K. * LEAVENWORTH xxx-xx-x...
SCOTT * MATZENBACHER xxx-xx-x...
MILES S. * MCCARTHY xxx-xx-x...
EUGENE W. * MCCOLLUM xxx-xx-x...
SHANNON S. * MCGEE xxx-xx-x...
STEVEN G. * MONTROY xxx-xx-x...
KEITH * NAPOLITANO xxx-xx-x...
KIMBERLY G. * PACKEN xxx-xx-x...
JOHN K. * PAUL, II xxx-xx-x...

CORAL M. * POUPEREZ xxx-xx-x
KENDALL L. * RAY xxx-xx-x
STEVEN P. * RUBCZAK xxx-xx-x
PATRICK A. * SCIOSCIA xxx-xx-x
ANA * SERRANTOTIRADO xxx-xx-x
COLLEEN C. * SHULL xxx-xx-x
BORIS J. * SIDOW xxx-xx-x
JOHN A. * STEVENS xxx-xx-x
ANGEL A. * VEGA xxx-xx-x
DAVID A. VINCENT xxx-xx-x
PAUL J. WARDEN xxx-xx-x
TODD Z. * WENTZ xxx-xx-x
EDMUND L. * YEPEZ xxx-xx-x

MEDICAL CORPS

To be major

FRANCIS J. * ABDOL xxx-xx-x
CHRISTOPHER * ACKER xxx-xx-x
MARY C. * AGUIAR xxx-xx-x
RODNEY H. * ALLEN xxx-xx-x
STEVEN B. * ALLEN xxx-xx-x
DAVID K. * ALLRED xxx-xx-x
GLADYS * ALVARADO xxx-xx-x
STEVEN L. * AMBROSIO xxx-xx-x
MILTON W. * ANDERSON xxx-xx-x
PHILEMON * ANDERSON xxx-xx-x
BRIANT * ANTHONY xxx-xx-x
EDWARD D. ARRINGTON xxx-xx-x
MARY T. * BAKER xxx-xx-x
THOMAS P. * BAKER xxx-xx-x
ROBERT J. * BALOTIN xxx-xx-x
LIN * BASSETTSHAPIRO xxx-xx-x
ITALO * BASTIANELLI xxx-xx-x
TERRY D. * BAUCH xxx-xx-x
KATHERINE L. * BEVILL xxx-xx-x
MONELLE G. * BISSON xxx-xx-x
JUDITH C. * BLAISE xxx-xx-x
JODIE L. * BOLI xxx-xx-x
STEPHEN L. * BOLI xxx-xx-x
CRAIG M. * BONE xxx-xx-x
OTTO F. * BONETA xxx-xx-x
MARIAN E. * BONNER xxx-xx-x
THOMAS D. BRESLEY xxx-xx-x
GEORGE * BROUGHTON xxx-xx-x
MAURICE D. * BROWN xxx-xx-x
MICHAEL E. * BROWN xxx-xx-x
PENNY C. * BROWN xxx-xx-x
JANUS D. * BUTCHER xxx-xx-x
JOHN P. * BYERS xxx-xx-x
SCOT C. * CALLAHAN xxx-xx-x
WILLIAM C. * CALTON xxx-xx-x
TERRI L. * CALVERT xxx-xx-x
JOHN * CAMPBELL xxx-xx-x
ANTHONY J. CAMPBELL xxx-xx-x
ANNE W. * CANNARD xxx-xx-x
CHARLES C. * CARDONE xxx-xx-x
BONNIE J. * CATTERSON xxx-xx-x
BRIAN E. * CAVALLARO xxx-xx-x
EDMUND * CAVAZOS, II xxx-xx-x
BRUCE * CHAMBERLAIN xxx-xx-x
DEBORAH * CHAN xxx-xx-x
CARLA D. * CHAPMAN xxx-xx-x
DARREN C. * CHAPMAN xxx-xx-x
BRUCE * CHEN xxx-xx-x
WAYNE N. * CHIU xxx-xx-x
GREGORY E. * CHOW xxx-xx-x
JEFFREY * CHRISTIAN xxx-xx-x
PAUL T. * CIRANGLO xxx-xx-x
LAWRENCE E. * CLAP xxx-xx-x
DANIEL C. * CLARK xxx-xx-x
GARY W. CLARK xxx-xx-x
JOSEPH Y. * CLARK xxx-xx-x
HEIDI L. CLOSE xxx-xx-x
MARK L. * COCHRAN xxx-xx-x
JOSEPH L. * COLLINS xxx-xx-x
TIMOTHY A. * COLLINS xxx-xx-x
JAN M. COMBS xxx-xx-x
EVERETT B. * COOPER xxx-xx-x
NORVELL V. * COOTS xxx-xx-x
STEVEN W. * CORSO xxx-xx-x
BRIAN E. * COTHERN xxx-xx-x
KEVIN W. * COX xxx-xx-x
STEVEN M. * CRENSHAW xxx-xx-x
KEVIN * CRUTCHFIELD xxx-xx-x
TALLEY * CULCLASURE xxx-xx-x
JAMES A. DAHL xxx-xx-x
JOSEPH N. * DANIEL xxx-xx-x
HUU N. * DAO xxx-xx-x
CHRISTOPHER * DILLON xxx-xx-x
LOUIS A. * DINATTO xxx-xx-x
DOMENICK E. * DIRCO xxx-xx-x
WAYNE H. * DUKE xxx-xx-x
SHERRIL E. * DURBIN xxx-xx-x
DWIGH * DYKSTERHOUSE xxx-xx-x
JAMES P. * EARLE xxx-xx-x
CYNTHIA L. * EATON xxx-xx-x
SANDRA J. * EDWARDS xxx-xx-x
JOHN R. * EKSTRAND xxx-xx-x
PATRICK L. * ELLIOT xxx-xx-x
JAMES * ELLIS xxx-xx-x
SUSAN F. * EMANUEL xxx-xx-x
JERRY A. * EVANS xxx-xx-x
MITCHELL J. * FAKTOR xxx-xx-x
LILIA A. FANNIN xxx-xx-x
GERALD L. FARRER xxx-xx-x
LOIS A. * FIALA xxx-xx-x
ROBERTA F. FICKER xxx-xx-x
MELTON H. * FISH xxx-xx-x
NEIL A. * FISHER xxx-xx-x
RANDALL G. * FISHER xxx-xx-x
STEPHEN F. * FLAHERTY xxx-xx-x

DAVID T. * FLOYD xxx-xx-x
ERIN P. * FOLEY xxx-xx-x
ROBERT A. * FORBES xxx-xx-x
WAYNE T. * FRANK xxx-xx-x
DERRICK B. * GALAPON xxx-xx-x
JOHN J. * GARCIA xxx-xx-x
BARTON K. * GEORGE xxx-xx-x
BENJAMIN N. * GILBERT xxx-xx-x
MARY M. GIUSEPPE xxx-xx-x
BRUCE E. * GOECKERT xxx-xx-x
DAVID P. * GOLDMAN xxx-xx-x
DOMINGO P. * GONZALEZ xxx-xx-x
JEFFREY * GORDON xxx-xx-x
ALLISON L. * GORSKI xxx-xx-x
PAUL E. * GOTT xxx-xx-x
PHILIP E. * GREILICH xxx-xx-x
WAYNE E. * HACHEY xxx-xx-x
NELSON A. * HAGER xxx-xx-x
NYUN C. * HAN xxx-xx-x
DAVID D. * HARRELL xxx-xx-x
LISA S. * HARRING xxx-xx-x
VIRGINIA K. * HASSETT xxx-xx-x
JANE E. * HAYDEN xxx-xx-x
JACKIE A. * HAYES xxx-xx-x
MARK D. * HEIBEL xxx-xx-x
BETHANY S. * HELVIG xxx-xx-x
MYRA A. * HENDERSON xxx-xx-x
MATTHEW W. * HENIGES xxx-xx-x
DOUGLAS A. * HENNING xxx-xx-x
GREGORY E. * HERMAN xxx-xx-x
DAVID * HIGGINBOTHAM xxx-xx-x
WILLIAM K. * HIROTA xxx-xx-x
DAVID M. * HIRSCH xxx-xx-x
STEVEN E. * HOLI xxx-xx-x
TIMOTHY G. * HOOD xxx-xx-x
DUANE R. * HOSFENTH xxx-xx-x
MARK A. * HOUNGLAND xxx-xx-x
DAVID S. * HOWARD xxx-xx-x
DONALD W. * HUFFMAN xxx-xx-x
WILLIAM T. * HUMPHREY xxx-xx-x
JEFFREY L. * JACKSON xxx-xx-x
KAREN B. * JOHANSEN xxx-xx-x
LUTHER B. JOHANSEN xxx-xx-x
CYNTHIA A. * KAHN xxx-xx-x
DEVESH * KANJARPANI xxx-xx-x
MICHAEL A. * KARF xxx-xx-x
LISA W. * KEEF xxx-xx-x
COLIN T. KELLEY xxx-xx-x
KENNETH R. * KEMI xxx-xx-x
KEVIN L. * KENWORTHY xxx-xx-x
THOMAS E. * KILKENNY xxx-xx-x
ANDREW W. * KING xxx-xx-x
DANIEL J. * KINGSBURY xxx-xx-x
THOMAS E. KINGSLEY xxx-xx-x
WENTZELLE * KITCHENS xxx-xx-x
MARK D. * KLINE xxx-xx-x
DAVID J. * KNAPI xxx-xx-x
ALBERT B. * KNOUSE xxx-xx-x
JOSEPH R. KOLB xxx-xx-x
MARK G. * KORTEPETER xxx-xx-x
CHRISTOP * KOZLOWSKI xxx-xx-x
DAVID A. * KRISTO xxx-xx-x
KEVIN M. * KUMKE xxx-xx-x
THEODORE J. * KUTCHER xxx-xx-x
MARK S. * LAFAYE xxx-xx-x
REED R. * LAMBERT xxx-xx-x
BRIAN F. * LANE xxx-xx-x
JOHN J. * LASSEGARRI xxx-xx-x
LOUIS D. * LATORRE xxx-xx-x
JEFFREY A. LAWSON xxx-xx-x
ELLEN F. * LAZARUS xxx-xx-x
DANIEL D. * LE xxx-xx-x
HEE C. LEE xxx-xx-x
BRUCE A. * LEFF xxx-xx-x
BRIAN C. LEIN xxx-xx-x
MICHAEL E. * LEONARD xxx-xx-x
KATHLEEN U. * LEO xxx-xx-x
LEONARD J. * LEONE xxx-xx-x
LAWRENCE S. * LEPLA xxx-xx-x
EDWARD F. * LEUSCHNER xxx-xx-x
EDWARD K. * LEVENTHAL xxx-xx-x
THOMAS E. * LEVOYER xxx-xx-x
ANGELA D. * LEVY xxx-xx-x
CHRISTINE M. * LEVY xxx-xx-x
JILL A. * LINDSTROM xxx-xx-x
MARGARET B. * LISECKI xxx-xx-x
MELISSA H. * LOUGHNEY xxx-xx-x
LEWIS L. * LOW xxx-xx-x
SHARON L. * LUDWIG xxx-xx-x
GEORGE H. * LUM xxx-xx-x
CARL E. * LUTHER xxx-xx-x
JEFFREY MACINTOSH xxx-xx-x
SARAH R. * MACK xxx-xx-x
JOHN F. * MACKAY xxx-xx-x
ANDREW J. * MACLELLAN xxx-xx-x
KENDA R. * MADANY xxx-xx-x
TIMOTHY * MALINOWSKI xxx-xx-x
GREGG A. * MALMQUIST xxx-xx-x
FRANCIS J. * MALONE xxx-xx-x
DAVID G. * MALPASS xxx-xx-x
BARRY E. * MARCHETTO xxx-xx-x
GREGOR * MARINKOVICH xxx-xx-x
PHYLLIS * MASONWELLS xxx-xx-x
JOHN R. * MAYER xxx-xx-x
RAYMOND C. * MAYS xxx-xx-x
BRADLEY T. * MCCALL xxx-xx-x
SHERMAN A. MCCALL xxx-xx-x
MATTHEW J. * MCCARTY xxx-xx-x
DONALD R. MCCLELLAN xxx-xx-x
SUSAN E. * MCCORMICK xxx-xx-x
SCOTT E. * MCDONALD xxx-xx-x
JOHN A. * MCHENRY xxx-xx-x

DANIEL * MCLAUGHLIN xxx-xx-x
THOMAS * MCLAUGHLIN xxx-xx-x
WILLIS A. MCVAY xxx-xx-x
QUERUBIN P. * MENDOZA xxx-xx-x
THOMAS H. * METZ xxx-xx-x
COLIN K. * MILLER xxx-xx-x
JERRY J. MILLER xxx-xx-x
ANTHONY J. * MOORMAN xxx-xx-x
RICHARD T. * MORMAN xxx-xx-x
RONALD L. * MORTON xxx-xx-x
MICHAEL L. * MULLEN xxx-xx-x
MERIDYTH K. * MUNNS xxx-xx-x
TIMOTHY R. * MURRAY xxx-xx-x
SCOTT D. * MURTHA xxx-xx-x
CAROLINE T. * MUSCARI xxx-xx-x
RICKEY C. * MYHAND xxx-xx-x
CLIFFORD M. * MYLES xxx-xx-x
GEORGE M. * NABBY xxx-xx-x
AUDREY A. * NARDUCCI xxx-xx-x
SRIDHAR * NATARAJAN xxx-xx-x
KAREN M. * NELSON xxx-xx-x
PAULA J. * NINER xxx-xx-x
MARK R. * NORWID xxx-xx-x
SHERI Y. * NOTTESTAL xxx-xx-x
HOWARD G. OAKS xxx-xx-x
JEFFREY * OETTINGER xxx-xx-x
ROBERT J. OGLESBY xxx-xx-x
COLIN K. * OHRT xxx-xx-x
BENJAMIN T. * OLDHAM xxx-xx-x
CAROL L. * OLNICK xxx-xx-x
TIMOTHY J. * ONEIL xxx-xx-x
KELLY M. * ONEILL xxx-xx-x
ALANZO * ORTEGA xxx-xx-x
JOSEPH PAFUMY xxx-xx-x
THOMAS E. * PAGE xxx-xx-x
FREDERIC * PALMQUIST xxx-xx-x
MARY F. * PARKER xxx-xx-x
DANIEL G. * PATERSON xxx-xx-x
GEORGE D. * PATRIN xxx-xx-x
GEORGE E. * PEOPLES xxx-xx-x
ISABE * PEREZALSTON xxx-xx-x
CHARLES J. * PERROTTA xxx-xx-x
GREGORY PETERMANN xxx-xx-x
JOHN Y. * PHELPS xxx-xx-x
DAVID * PHUNG xxx-xx-x
THOMAS R. * PLACE xxx-xx-x
FREDRIC R. * PLOTKIN xxx-xx-x
ALBERT V. * PORAMBO xxx-xx-x
STUART B. * PORTER xxx-xx-x
STEVEN J. * POSNICK xxx-xx-x
ROBERT S. * POWELL xxx-xx-x
LAURA L. * PRATT xxx-xx-x
KELLY D. PRIDGEN xxx-xx-x
TEDD R. * PUCKETT xxx-xx-x
MALEKA * QAYUMI xxx-xx-x
STEPHEN D. RABORN xxx-xx-x
MICHAEL G. * RAPPA xxx-xx-x
DANIEL R. * REICHERT xxx-xx-x
JAY G. * REID xxx-xx-x
JAY A. * RIDDLE xxx-xx-x
MARIANNE C. * RIES xxx-xx-x
PATRICK * ROBERTSON xxx-xx-x
MICHAEL D. * ROBINSON xxx-xx-x
RANDAL D. ROBINSON xxx-xx-x
JEFFREY E. * RODZAR xxx-xx-x
ROZALYNDE R. * ROGERS xxx-xx-x
JOHN H. * ROMANOW xxx-xx-x
BRADLEY J. * ROTH xxx-xx-x
MICHAEL J. * ROY xxx-xx-x
STEVEN A. * RUDDI xxx-xx-x
PAUL A. * RUGGIERO xxx-xx-x
PETER * RUGGIERO xxx-xx-x
TODD M. * RUMANS xxx-xx-x
KEVIN J. * SARTORE xxx-xx-x
JAMES C. * SARTORE xxx-xx-x
JOHN R. * SASHKO xxx-xx-x
DARRELL K. * SCALAS xxx-xx-x
EILEEN * SCANLAN xxx-xx-x
JAY J. * SCHANTZEN xxx-xx-x
DAVID E. * SCHENK xxx-xx-x
JOHN R. * SCHULTZ xxx-xx-x
JACK D. * SCOTT xxx-xx-x
ROBERT F. * SEARLES xxx-xx-x
CRAIG K. * SETO xxx-xx-x
NEAL I. * SHPARAK xxx-xx-x
CRAIG A. * SIMON xxx-xx-x
CHRISTOPHER * SINHA xxx-xx-x
JOHN G. * SIROIS xxx-xx-x
BRICE T. SMITH xxx-xx-x
CURTIS M. * SORESENSEN xxx-xx-x
JENNIFER M. * SOYKI xxx-xx-x
GREGORY L. * SPEARS xxx-xx-x
DAVID B. * SPROAT xxx-xx-x
NICHOLAS * STAMATOS xxx-xx-x
SARAH S. * STEINBAUM xxx-xx-x
MARK R. * STORM xxx-xx-x
PETER D. * SWANN xxx-xx-x
DAVID R. * SYDOW xxx-xx-x
LESLIE W. * TAM xxx-xx-x
FRANCIS V. * TAPIN xxx-xx-x
DAVID O. * TAYLOR xxx-xx-x
TIMOTHY O. * TAYLOR xxx-xx-x
HEIDI P. TERRIO xxx-xx-x
JAMES D. TERRIO xxx-xx-x
JOHN R. * THOMPSON xxx-xx-x
SONJA M. * THOMPSON xxx-xx-x
MONTGOMERY * THORNE xxx-xx-x
BRIAN K. * THWAITES xxx-xx-x
JONATHAN B. * THYNG xxx-xx-x
GLEN E. * TOMKINS xxx-xx-x
JUAN * TORRESCORDERO xxx-xx-x
DAVID P. * TRACY xxx-xx-x

ROBERT F. * TYRES xxx-xx-x
BRIAN K. UNWIN xxx-xx-x
RODERICK S. * VOGEL xxx-xx-x
DANIEL E. * WALKER xxx-xx-x
EUGENIA S. * WALSH xxx-xx-x
ROBERT A. * WASCHER xxx-xx-x
PAUL G. * WEAVER xxx-xx-x
STEVEN E. * WEBER xxx-xx-x
GREGORY P. * WELCH xxx-xx-x
MARK D. * WESTFALL xxx-xx-x
WILLIAM W. * WHARTON xxx-xx-x
DAVID C. * WHITE xxx-xx-x
CHARLES B. * WHITLOW xxx-xx-x
GLENN R. * WILLETT xxx-xx-x
ROBERT W. * WILTSHIRE xxx-xx-x
JOHN M. * WING xxx-xx-x
GLENN W. * WORTMANN xxx-xx-x
CARL S. * WROBLESK xxx-xx-x
JULIE A. * WUEST xxx-xx-x
JOHN S. * XENOS xxx-xx-x
ROBERT M. * YACINTO xxx-xx-x
LAWRENCE B. * YELLIN xxx-xx-x
NICHOLAS J. YOKAN xxx-xx-x
WILLIAM J. YOSTAN xxx-xx-x
CLIFTON E. * YU xxx-xx-x
VIKRAM P. * ZALOX xxx-xx-x
JOHN J. * ZAPF xxx-xx-x
GEORGE W. * ZIMMERMAN xxx-xx-x

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS, ON THE ACTIVE DUTY LIST, FOR PROMOTION TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 624, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE. THE OFFICERS INDICATED BY ASTERISK ARE ALSO NOMINATED FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 531, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE:

DENTAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

JAMES R. * ALLINDER xxx-xx-x
THOMAS F. * ARMSTRONG xxx-xx-x
RANDALL N. * BALL xxx-xx-x
ZOLTAN T. BERKY xxx-xx-x
ROBERT W. * BLOOM xxx-xx-x
BRUCE B. * BREHM xxx-xx-x
MICHAEL D. * BROWN xxx-xx-x
GEORGE BUMGARDNER xxx-xx-x
EDWARD J. CATHRIGHT xxx-xx-x
DAVID Y. CHANG xxx-xx-x
MICHAEL V. * CLARK xxx-xx-x
TIMOTHY J. COEN xxx-xx-x
ANNE M. * COMPTON xxx-xx-x
GARY P. * CONNELLY xxx-xx-x
MARSHALL R. * COM xxx-xx-x
STEVEN E. * CROSS xxx-xx-x
RANDY N. * DAVIS xxx-xx-x
ROGER T. * ELLIS xxx-xx-x
WILLIAM C. ELTON xxx-xx-x
BRIAN FITZPATRICK xxx-xx-x
DONALD W. FOSTER xxx-xx-x
BETTY G. * GALVAN xxx-xx-x
DAVID A. GALVAN xxx-xx-x
TIMOTHY J. * GEREY xxx-xx-x
ROGER D. GLEN xxx-xx-x
THERESA S. * GOZALES xxx-xx-x
GLENN A. * GREEN xxx-xx-x
PATRICE E. * GREEN xxx-xx-x
TAM S. * HAGER xxx-xx-x
WILLIAM H. * HALL xxx-xx-x
PRISCILLA HAMILL xxx-xx-x
ALAN HAROIAN xxx-xx-x
KURT J. * HASSEL xxx-xx-x
JOHN W. HELLSTEIN xxx-xx-x
GREGORY A. * JACKSON xxx-xx-x
KENNETH C. KEATE xxx-xx-x
KRAIG K. KENNY xxx-xx-x
DAVID E. KOSIOWSKI xxx-xx-x
ALAN N. * KUHR xxx-xx-x
THOMAS B. LEFLE xxx-xx-x
CLYDE W. * LONG xxx-xx-x
ROBERT W. * LUTKE xxx-xx-x
JEFFERY O. LUZADER xxx-xx-x
ROBERT S. MATTHEWS xxx-xx-x
WILLIAM K. * MAYHEW xxx-xx-x
MICHAEL F. MCCARTHY xxx-xx-x
MARCUS F. MCDONALD xxx-xx-x
MARK N. MCDONALD xxx-xx-x
EDWARD J. MISTAK xxx-xx-x
RAYMOND R. * NYKAZA xxx-xx-x
FRANK E. ORR xxx-xx-x
MICHAEL G. * PAGE xxx-xx-x
FRANCISCO RUIZ xxx-xx-x
BRION C. SMITH xxx-xx-x
RONALD S. STANKO xxx-xx-x
ROSS W. STRYKER xxx-xx-x
LOUIS J. TALOUIMIS xxx-xx-x
DWIGHT E. * THOMPSON xxx-xx-x
STEVEN H. * THOMPSON xxx-xx-x
GEORGE E. TOLSON xxx-xx-x
ANN S. VONGONTEN xxx-xx-x
ROBERT M. * WEAVER xxx-xx-x
ROBERT J. WILHELM xxx-xx-x
CRAIG C. WILLARD xxx-xx-x
CRAIG J. WILLIAMS xxx-xx-x
ROGER WORTHINGTON xxx-xx-x

MEDICAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

MARIO H. ALVARADO xxx-xx-x

GREGG T. * ANDERS xxx-xx-x
WILLIAM C. * ANDOLSEN xxx-xx-x
GUILLERMO W. * ARNAUD xxx-xx-x
BRIAN K. * BARNARD xxx-xx-x
DAVID M. BARTOSZEN xxx-xx-x
JAMES M. * BAUNCHALK xxx-xx-x
JOANNA C. * BEACHY xxx-xx-x
ERIC W. * BERG xxx-xx-x
KENNETH * BODDIE xxx-xx-x
EMMAN * BONNECARRERE xxx-xx-x
JON C. * BOWERSOX xxx-xx-x
JOHN D. * BROOKE xxx-xx-x
LARRY D. * BROWN xxx-xx-x
THOMAS J. * BURKE xxx-xx-x
PETER F. * BURNS xxx-xx-x
DAVID G. BURRIS xxx-xx-x
BRADLEY G. * BUTT xxx-xx-x
JENNIFER L. * CALAGA xxx-xx-x
JUDITH * CHANTELOIS xxx-xx-x
ARUNDHA * CHATTERJEE xxx-xx-x
THEODORE J. * CIESLAN xxx-xx-x
WILLIAM W. COLLIER xxx-xx-x
JAY F. * COOK xxx-xx-x
JONATHAN F. * COON xxx-xx-x
JOHN S. * CROWLEY xxx-xx-x
DON J. DANIELS xxx-xx-x
DANIEL R. * DAVISON xxx-xx-x
BERNARD L. * DEKONING xxx-xx-x
GARY L. * DIEI xxx-xx-x
BENJAMIN W. DUNN xxx-xx-x
DANNY M. * DOUGLAS xxx-xx-x
MAX B. * DUNCAN xxx-xx-x
ERWOOD G. * EDWARDS xxx-xx-x
DIRK M. * ELSTON xxx-xx-x
JEFFREY A. ELTING xxx-xx-x
RAYMOND * ENZENAUBER xxx-xx-x
JOSEPH J. * ERNST xxx-xx-x
VINCENT * EUSTERMANN xxx-xx-x
JOHN R. * FAZIO xxx-xx-x
STEVEN F. * FINDE xxx-xx-x
KENNETH I. * FINK xxx-xx-x
DANIEL * FITZPATRICK xxx-xx-x
CHARLES W. * FORD xxx-xx-x
MARK S. * FOSTER xxx-xx-x
DANIEL W. * GARLAND xxx-xx-x
JAMES A. GEILING xxx-xx-x
ROYAL K. * GEROW xxx-xx-x
MARTIN B. GIANDONI xxx-xx-x
JOHN L. * GILLILANI xxx-xx-x
THOMAS S. GORMLEY xxx-xx-x
ROBERT M. * GUM xxx-xx-x
JEFFR GUZENHAUSE xxx-xx-x
MICHAEL P. * HAGAN xxx-xx-x
SHARON L. HAMMOND xxx-xx-x
KURT L. * HANSBERRY xxx-xx-x
ELIZABETH A. HANSEN xxx-xx-x
GEORGE * HARRINGTON xxx-xx-x
MARK D. * HAYS xxx-xx-x
ERIC R. HELANDER xxx-xx-x
EDWARD S. * HEMPHILL xxx-xx-x
BLAINE R. * HERIC xxx-xx-x
NORMAN A. * HETZEL xxx-xx-x
GEORGE F. * HODGES xxx-xx-x
KENT C. * HOLTZMULLER xxx-xx-x
WAYNE T. * HONEYCUTT xxx-xx-x
THOMAS M. HOWARD xxx-xx-x
JEFFREY M. HRUTKA xxx-xx-x
WALTER J. * HUBICKI xxx-xx-x
THOMAS L. * IRVIN xxx-xx-x
EUGENE J. IWANYK xxx-xx-x
FRANK H. * JAHNS xxx-xx-x
ISMAIL * JATO xxx-xx-x
BRIAN P. * JOHNSON xxx-xx-x
FREDERIC * JOHNSTONE xxx-xx-x
JAMES G. JOLISSAINT xxx-xx-x
RONALD G. * JONES xxx-xx-x
DAVID A. * JORDAN xxx-xx-x
LEE W. * JORDAN xxx-xx-x
CHRISTOPH KAUFMANN xxx-xx-x
DANIEL N. * KAYANAN xxx-xx-x
MARK S. * KESTNER xxx-xx-x
DAVID KISHBAUGH xxx-xx-x
JONATHAN P. * KUSHNER xxx-xx-x
YVONNE L. * LAMY xxx-xx-x
JAMES J. LEECH xxx-xx-x
ANGELINA J. LEPAGE xxx-xx-x
PAUL A. LEPAGE xxx-xx-x
SCOT M. * LEWEY xxx-xx-x
DAWN E. * LIGHT xxx-xx-x
RONALD A. LISS xxx-xx-x
KATHERINE * LOVELLA xxx-xx-x
ROBERT C. LYONS xxx-xx-x
JAY D. * MABREY xxx-xx-x
GEORGE M. * MAHER xxx-xx-x
JOHN T. MCBRIDE xxx-xx-x
EMMA L. * MCCORMACK xxx-xx-x
PETER L. * MCEVOY xxx-xx-x
EDWARD B. * MCWHIRT xxx-xx-x
DALIA * MERCEDBRUNG xxx-xx-x
CHARLES S. MILLIKEN xxx-xx-x
WILLIAM F. * MISEN xxx-xx-x
REGINALD H. MOORE xxx-xx-x
JAMES A. * MORGAN xxx-xx-x
MICHAEL R. * MORRIS xxx-xx-x
JUDD W. * MOULTON xxx-xx-x
JOSEPH R. * MURPHY xxx-xx-x
STEPHEN P. * MURRAY xxx-xx-x
THEODORE S. NAM xxx-xx-x
KATHI * NORTHWELL xxx-xx-x
JAMES M. OLSEN xxx-xx-x
STEPHEN B. * OLSEN xxx-xx-x
DAVID T. ORMAN xxx-xx-x

CAROLE A. ORTENZON xxx-xx-x
DANIEL R. * OUELLETTE xxx-xx-x
ELMER J. * PACHECO xxx-xx-x
VERNON C. PARMLEY xxx-xx-x
MICHAEL * PASQUARELLA xxx-xx-x
ALAN D. PEARSON xxx-xx-x
RONALD * POROPATICH xxx-xx-x
MADHUKAR K. * PUNJA xxx-xx-x
DEGRACIA QUINONES xxx-xx-x
WILLIAM W. REED xxx-xx-x
THOMAS J. REID xxx-xx-x
DONN R. RICHARDS xxx-xx-x
FRANKLIN E. * ROIG xxx-xx-x
CLYDE R. * ROY xxx-xx-x
JOHN J. * RYAN xxx-xx-x
VIVENCIO L. * SALCEDO xxx-xx-x
CURT P. * SAMLASKA xxx-xx-x
VIJAY K. * SANGAR xxx-xx-x
DON W. * SHAFFER xxx-xx-x
TIMOTHY R. * SHAVER xxx-xx-x
LEONORA O. SHAW xxx-xx-x
KENNETH E. * SHERMAN xxx-xx-x
KENNETH J. * SIMCIC xxx-xx-x
DONALD R. SKILLMAN xxx-xx-x
DICK D. * SLATER xxx-xx-x
CRAIG E. * SMITH xxx-xx-x
BONNIE L. * SMOAN xxx-xx-x
CHARLES R. * SOULIER xxx-xx-x
JEFFREY C. * STILES xxx-xx-x
JONATHAN G. * STODOL xxx-xx-x
WAYNE C. * STUART xxx-xx-x
JOEL M. * SUMFEST xxx-xx-x
ALLEN B. THACH xxx-xx-x
ROBERT S. * THOMAS xxx-xx-x
DUANE D. TIPPETS xxx-xx-x
DRAGO * TOLOSA xxx-xx-x
CHRISTOPHE * TROMARE xxx-xx-x
CHARLES L. * TRUWIT xxx-xx-x
JOHN M. UHORCHAK xxx-xx-x
WILL * VORDERBRUGGE xxx-xx-x
SIMON G. * WALL xxx-xx-x
HARRY L. WARREN xxx-xx-x
GLENN M. WASSERMAN xxx-xx-x
RAYMOND W. * WATERS xxx-xx-x
ROBERT R. * WITTLER xxx-xx-x
CARL C. * YODER xxx-xx-x
GLEN Y. YOSHIDA xxx-xx-x
MARIANNE M. YOUNG xxx-xx-x

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED U.S. NAVAL RESERVE OFFICERS, WHO ARE NAVAL ACADEMY GRADUATES, TO BE APPOINTED PERMANENT ENSIGN IN THE LINE OR STAFF CORPS OF THE U.S. NAVY, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 531:

NAVAL RESERVE OFFICERS, USN

To be ensign; permanent

ROBERT BRADLEY AARNES
PHILIP MICHAEL
ADRIANO
LEOPOLDO SARDALLA
ALBA, JR.
BRENT ADDISON ALFONZO
JASON YANAR ALLEE
JASON CHRISTOPHER
ALLEYNE
ANDREW ALAN ALOISIO
HERNAN ORLANDO
ALTAMAR ESTRADA
HEIDI MARIE ALTHOFF
CHRISTOPHER CHAD
ALVAREZ
MICHAEL TIMOTHY AMOS
KEVIN WARREN ANDERSEN
JAMES ARTHUR ANDERSON
JENNIFER LYNN
ANDERSON
JUSTIN PATRICK ANDREWS
ERIC JOSE ANDUZE
DARREN RAYMOND
ANZELONE
EDGAR FABILA ARNALDO
TODD ROBERT ARNESON
MATTHEW DAVID ARNOLD
JAIMESON JOSEPH ARNONE
MATTHEW LINDH ARNY
RICHARD CHARLES
ARTHUR
GARRETT CHRISTOPHER
ARTZ
BENJAMIN JESSE ASH
DAVID HERRINGTON ASHBY
ARLEN EDWARD ASPENSON
ROBERTO JOSE ATHA, JR.
KEVIN LOUIS AUSTIN
ERIC JOSEF BACH
KATHERINE LOUISE
BADGLEY
EUGENE RAYMOND BAILEY
LAURA ANN BAJOR
ANTHONY POWER BAKER
DOUGLAS CONAN BAKER
JOHN ANTHONY BALTES
JONATHAN BAUTISTA
BARON
JEFFREY ISAAC BARR
ROBERT VINCENT BARTHEL
JOSEPH WILLIAM BARTISH
IV
WILLIAM ANDREW BARTLE
DANIEL VERNON BAXTER
JOHN ALLEN BAYLESS
CHRISTOPHER STUART
BEAUFAIT
CHRISTOPHER THOMAS
BECK
DAVID GEORGE BEITER
STEPHEN JOSH BELL
BRIAN CHARLES BENDER
JASON HORST BENNETT
AARON DEWAYNE BENWAY
JEFFREY ALAN BERNHARD
ROBERT MOGABGAB
BERRYMAN
STEPHEN ANTHONY BISHOP
JAMES BRETT BLANTON
JAMEY JOHN BLOCK
JOY MARGUERITE BLOOM
DAMIAN SENNEN BLOSSEY
MATTHEW ROY BLUNT
SCOTT ALLEN BOEDEKER
JAMES BRITTON BOHN
JOHN DANIEL BOONE
MICHAEL JAMES BOONE
JAMES PATRICK MARSH
BORGHARDT
JEFFREY SCOTT BOROS
DAVID WILLIAM BORUSHKO
JAMES RICHARD BOSS
TIMOTHY ERIC BOURDON
COLIN ANDREW BOWSER
KEVIN PAGE BOYKIN
JOSEPH PHILIP BOZZELLI
BRADY ADAMS BRADY
HEATHER DAVIS BRAND
MICHAEL TIMOTHY
BRASWELL, JR.
JONATHAN WILLIAM
BRAUN
ROBERT JAMES BRAUN
ERIC JASON BRENDEN
MICHELE MARIE BRETT
DAVID ALLEN BRETZ
DAMIAN HOLLAND
BRIDGES
WALTER ELMER
BRIDGMAN, III
STEPHANIE MICHELLE
BRILL
ROBERT DONALD BRODIE

CHRISTOPHER TERENCE BROWN
JAMES EDWARD BROWN
KARY NIKOLAI BROWNLEE
BRET RYAN BRUCHOK
ERIC THOMAS BRUNS
JERRY MICHAEL BRYL
BRYAN JOSEPH BULJAT
KRISTIN MICHELLE BURBAGE
MICHAEL LOUIS BURD
COLVERT PEGOLLO
BURGOS
THEODORE MICHAEL BURK
BRIAN JOHN BURKE
RICHARD ALAN BUTLER
TODD ANDREW BUTLER
JAMES HARRISON BYRD, JR.
KEVIN PATRICK BYRNE
MARCELLO DOMINIC CACERES
SCOTT NELSON CALLAHAN
GREGORY CAMERON
KYLE RICHARD CAMPBELL
RANSEN JULES CAOLA, JR.
KEVIN NOEL CARADONA
MARC GEORGE CARLSON
ARON SHEA CARMAN
ALBERTA CAMACHO CARPENTER
JEFFREY LEONARD CARPENTER
MARK GLENN CARTER
ROBERT ALFRED CASPER, JR.
CHRISTOPHER JOHN CASSIDY
ANGELO NICHOLAS CATALANO
DAVID MATTHEW CATTLER
CHRISTOPHER JAMES CAVANAUGH
JACOB ANDREW CHACKO
JONATHAN LYONS CHADWICK
DANIEL KIWAN CHANG
GREGORY FREDERICK CHAPMAN
COLEY CLINTON CHAPPELL
FELIPE ROBERTO CHARRAN GUZMAN
DENISE LEIGH CHATFIELD
ROBERT LAWRENCE CHESSE
CHRISTOPHER JOSEPH CHILBERT
MICHAEL CASEY CHOATE
RYAN GUST CHRISTOPHERSON
CHRISTOPHER JAMES CIZEK
JOSEPH MICHAEL CLARK, JR.
MICHAEL JAMES CLOYD
RELMOND BENNETT COBB
BRYAN MICHAEL COCHRAN
JAMES DOUGLAS COLLIER
JEFFREY SCOTT CONKLIN
NORA CATHELEN CONNELLY
SALVADOR CONTRERAS, III
CHARLES LEANDER CONVERSE
ERIC LAURENCE CONZEN
GEORGE HUBERT COOPER
PETER ANTHONY CORRAO, JR.
BERNARD ANTHONY CORREIA, III
JOSEPH LLOYD COX, IV
MARK ALBERT CRAWFORD
TIMOTHY MARTIN CRAWFORD
FREDERICK EARL CRECELIOUS
DENNIS QUIGLEY CRONYN
DEVAN JOHN NAPOLEON CROSS
ANNA CIELITO CRUZ
KRISTEN WILLIAMS CULLER
CORY LYNN CULVER
JAMES COLIN CUMMINGS
WILLIAM GENE CUSHMAN
SARAH ANN DACHOS
CHRISTOPHER MATTHEW DAGUE
RUTH ANNETTE DALTON
WILLIAM ROCKWELL DALY
ERIC ROBIN DANIELS
ANDREW DANIEL DANKO
BRAD BEHRING DAVIDSON
HEATHER LYNN DAVIES
JEFFREY SCOTT DAVIS
RICHARD STUART DAVIS
SCOTT ALBERT DAVITT
DANIEL MICHAEL DEGENER
KENNETH DONALD DEHAN
STEPHEN JOHN DELANTY
JAMES ALDRICH DELARODERIE

ALEXANDER JOHN DELCASTILLO
LARRY GENE DENTON, JR.
ROBERT DENTON, III
RALPH FREDERICK DEWALT, II
BRENDON THOMAS DIBELLA
BRIAN WAYNE DICKSON
TED ERIC DINKLOCKER
PHILLIP STEPHAN DOBBS
STEPHEN FRANCIS DOLING
TRAVIS BARRY DONE
BRAD PATRICK DONNELLY
ELLIOTT TODD DORHAM
HUGH JOSEPH DORRIAN, II
JEFFREY JAMES DRAEGER
DEBRA ANN DRAHEIM
MARC EDWARD DROBNY
JAY EDWARD DRYER
TERRENCE LLOYD DUDLEY
TODD CHRISTOPHER DUDLEY
PETER RAYMOND DUFOUR
MATTHEW CHARLES DUNAWAY
DAVID FIELD DUNCAN
MICHAEL GEORGE EARL
DANIEL GEOFFREY ECKERT
ROBERT VINCENT EGAN
JEFFREY WILLIAM EGGERS
JAMES JOSEPH ELIAS
CARLTON THOMAS ELLIOTT
THOMAS SCOTCHMER
ELIJAH II
HAROLD ALAN ELLSWORTH
PHILIP LEE ENGLE, JR.
JOSHUA GARY ENGLISH
GEOFFREY ALAN ENNS
ERIK JAMES ESLICH
DANILO ALFORQUE ESPIRITU, JR.
KELLY ANN EUBANKS
MARIA DENISE FALZONE
JUAN ANDRES FANJUL
ERIC CLAYTON FARRAR
MICHAEL GERARD FARREN
MICHAEL DAVID FAVETTI
JOHN ANDREW FAXIO
ROBERT KEEGAN FEDERAL, III
MATTHEW ROBERT FEENEY
MICHAEL EDWIN FENTON
JOHN HARLAN FERGUSON
KENNETH LEE FERGUSON
MARK JOSEPH FERNANDEZ
BRYAN JAMES FETTER
LESLEY JOHN FIERTS
NACIM ROBERT FIGGE
MATTHEW DAVID FINNEY
NICHOLAS JAMES FIORE
BENJAMIN THOMAS FITCHETT
MICHAEL WILLIAM FIVAS
MICHAEL SEAN FLATLEY
JORGE RICARDO FLORES
KEVIN ANDREW FLYNN
JEFFREY JOSEPH FOGARTY
ERIC NEIL FONTAINE
JOSEPH CARL FORAKER, III
MICHAEL AARON FOX
SUSANNE MARIE FRANKLIN
RICK JOHN FRATUS
KURT ENGELBERT FRICKER
JAMES EDWARD FRITSCH, JR.
WARDELL CONRAD FULLER
BRETT THOMAS FULLERTON
GEORGE GREGORY FUTCH
TODD ALAN GAGNON
MICHAEL PATRICK GALLAGHER
TIMOTHY JAMES GALLAGHER
GREGORY FRANCIS GALLMANN
DAVID PAUL GALLUS
FERNANDO GARCIA
JOANNA LEE GARCIA
KARL GARCIA
LINDA MARIE GARNER
CASEY CHARLES GARWOOD
MARC ANTHONY GENUALDI
MELISSA JOAN GERACE
ANDREW SHAWN GIBBONS
ANTHONY FRANCIS GILLESS
LYNN ANDREW GISH
J. SEARGEANT GLENN
ANTHONY SCOTT GLOVER
DAVID BURTON GLOVER
DAL HO GO
FREDERICK CARL GOLDHAMMER
ISSAC NNN GONZALEZ
SCOTT BRIAN GOOCH
ROBERT FRANKLIN GOODSON, II

JOHN JOSEPH GORDON
KYLE PACE GORDY
WAYNE GERALD GRASDOCK
MARIA LOUISE GRAUERHOLZ
MICHAEL JAMES GRAVITT
CHAD ROBERTS GRAY
AARON TIMBERLAKE GREENE
DANIEL EUGENE GREENE
MARCUS CHRISTOPHER GREENSPAN
JOHN DAVID GREMILLION
BRADLEY MAURICE GRESHAM
KENNETH JOSEPH GRIESER
NOEL MICHAEL GRIFFITH, JR.
CHRISTOPHER KIM CHON GRILLONE
JOHN REYNOLDS GROH, III
EDWIN JOHN GROHE, JR.
ADAM BRETT GROSSMAN
TIMOTHY SHAWN GUDUKAS
RICHARD CORY GUERIN
WAYNE DOUGLAS GUNTHER
JOHN DIETRICH HAASE
STEPHEN CHARLES HABERMAAS
LARS RAYMOND HAGENDORF ORLOFF
STEPHANIE ANNE HAHN
DENNIS RAY HALL, JR.
DANIEL JOSEPH HALLER
JASON GRAY HAMMOND
WILLIAM JESSE HANGER
TIMOTHY JOHN HANLEY
PHILLIP EDWARD HANSEN
HEATH LAMAR HANSHAW
CHRISTOPHER JOHN HANSON
KEVIN KARL HANSON
CHRISTOPHER GAVIN HARDING
BRIAN JAMES HARRIS
GLENN RUSSELL HARSHMAN
MONTY LANE HASENBANK
ANTHONY JOHN HATOK, JR.
ERIC JAMES HAWN
JOHN WILLIAM HAWVER
ERNEST EDWARD HAYNES, III
ALBON ONEAL HEAD, III
JOHN ANDREW HELLMANN
JAMES ALAN HENDERSON
RAY MARVIN HENDRIX, JR.
ALAN MICHAEL HERN
PATRICK LEE HERRERA
GERALD TODD HEYNE
TURHAN ISMAEL HIDALGO
JEFFREY BRIAN HILL
ALLEN LEE HOBBS
KELLY JEANNE HOEFT
TODD ALDEN HOFSTEDT
JOHN JOSEPH HOFER, JR.
STEPHEN BRUCE HOLLAND
MARK FREDRICK HOLZRICHTER
BRANDON ALAN HONEYCUTT
WADE HAMILTON HOOPER
JOHN WAYNE HOPKINS, JR.
JULIE ANN HOUSE
ROBERT THOMAS HOWARD
MONROE MARTIN HOWELL, II
CORY RICHARD HOWES
MICHAEL MING HUA HSU
GREGORY WRIGHT HUBBARD
DOUGLAS CHARLES HUNTINGTON
BRYAN ERIC HURD
JOHN FREEMAN HUSSEY, III
MATTHEW PALMER HYDE
MARK AARON IMBLUM
DARRELL BRIAN INGRAM
JOSEPH PATRICK IRETION, JR.
DAVID KERINGER ISMAY
MICHAEL KAZUO ITAKURA
JASON HILLARY JACK
STEPHEN JOSHUA JACKSON
JASON ERIC JAKUBOWSKI
OMAR ELIAS JANA
WILLIAM WORTHINGTON JEFFRIES
BYRON WADE JENKINS
GENTRY WADE JENSEN
JON LIAN JENSEN
WILLIAM HENRY JEWETT, III
CHARLES ADLER JOHNSON, JR.
DAVID ROBERT JOHNSON
NOEL PATRICK JOHNSON
TIMOTHY ALVIN JOHNSON
VINCENT RICHARD JOHNSON

WILLIAM SPENCER JOHNSON, V.
CORINNE RILEY JONES
DAVID STEWART JONES
JOHN FRANCIS JONES
MICHAEL PROCTOR JOYNER
JEFFREY ALLEN JURGENMEYER
BRIAN RICHARD JURUTKA
THOMAS CHARLES KAIT, JR.
WILLIAM RICHARD KANE
RONALD JAMES KARUN, JR.
PATRICK MICHAEL KEANE
DANIEL JOHN KECK
MICHAEL PATRICK KEITH
GREGORY BRIAN KELLER
SEAN GLEN KELLIHER
RICHARD MCCULLOUGH KELLY
KENNETH MATTHEW KEMBALL COOK
WILLIAM ANDREW KENDRICK
JOHN DAVID KENNARD
W. PAUL KENNEY, III
KARI ANN KENNY
LUCAS WAYNE KERLEY
CALEB ALAN KERR
KENDRA LEE KEWAK
DAVID MICHAEL KICK
JOHN PATRICK KILLACKY
ROY SUNG JOON KIM
ANDREW JAMES KIMSEY
RICHARD WILLIAM KINCAID
TYPHANIE ANNE KINDER
JEFFREY THOMAS KING
STEVEN MORRIS KING
BRADLEY LEE KINKADE
KELLY SUZANNE KINSALLA
DEAN RICHARD KINSMAN
KEITH RUSSELL KINTZLEY
CHRISTOPHER JON KIPP
ANDREW ALEXANDER KISS
KEVIN JOHN KLEIN
DAVID WILLIAM KLIEMANN
JAMES ANDREW KNOLL
WILLIAM KARL KNOX
GEORGE MARTIN KOLLAR
STEVEN THOMAS KONKOLY
TAKU KOPP
SETH KOVENSKY
MICHAEL DAVID KOZUB
SCOTT HUDSON KRAFT
JEFFREY KEITH KRAUSE, JR.
KIRSTEN MICHELE KRAWCZYK
JEFFREY EISEN KRISTICK
KAREN SEE KROEGER
MICHAEL SALVATORE KROT
KENNETH ALFRED KRUEGER
ROBERT KENNETH KUBERSKI, JR.
RYAN JAMES KUHLER
MICHAEL ALAN KUHN
MATTHEW ALYN LABONTE
ANDREW DENIS LAMORIE
JOHN WATSON LAND
JAMES ELLSWORTH LANDIS
BRIAN CHRISTOPHER LANTIER
SCOTT EDWARD LANTZY
CHAD MICHAEL LARGES
DAVID ARNOLD LARSEN
LARSON
CRAIG ROBERT LARSON
DEVIN TODD LASALLE
MATTHEW RICHARD LEAR
SCOTT HAROLD LEDIG
RICHARD SHANNON LEE
STEVEN SOOP LEE
PATRICK ROBERT LEHMAN
JAMES ALAN LENART
JOHN ROBERT LESKOVICH
ANDREW LAURIE LEWIS
CHRIS WALTER LEWIS
ANDREA LOUISE LINDENBERG
ERIC CARTER LINDFORS
HOWARD BRIAN LINK, JR.
SHAWN GARRETT LINTON
MATTHEW KNEELAND LOBNER
KIRK JAMES LOFTUS
ROBERT MAX LOHMAN, JR.
JULIA MARGARET LOPEZ
TIFFANY LYNN LORD
DANIEL WILLIAM LOUGHMAN
JAMES PAUL LOWELL
JOHN LEE LOWERY
LANCE JOEL LUKSIS
FRANK JOSEPH LUONGO
BRADLEY FRAZER MAAS
JONATHAN DAVID MACDONALD
GERALD JOHN MACENAS, II

JON TILESTON MACHARG
VICTOR RUBEN MACIAS
JOSEPH THOMAS MADRID
STEVEN ROBERT MAIER
CHRISTOPHER NOEL MANG
MARK MATTHEW MANN
RAYMOND MARCIANO, II
STACY ANN MARCOTT
CHRISTOPHER DAVID MARSH
JAMES JOHN MARSH, V.
RUSSELL EUGENE MARSH
MEI LING AMOY MARSHALL
CHRISTY ANNE MARTIN
MICHAEL ANTHONY MARTINEZ
JAMES WOODROW MASON
RICHARD NEIL MASSIE
STEVEN JOHN MATHEWS
JAY ALAN MATZKO
TANYA GOODEN MAYER
ARTHUR GITAU MBUTHIA
SHAUN COLLEEN MCANDREW
ERIN ANDREA MCAVOY
JAMES ARTHUR MCCALL, III
SCOTT DAVID MCCLELLAN
KEVIN JOSEPH MCCLOSKEY
WAYNE WILLIAM MCCOOL
MICHAEL AARON MCCORD
ROBERT ALLEN MCCORMICK, JR.
MELANIE CLAIRE MCGEE
WILLIAM MCGILL, JR.
PATRICK JOSEPH MCGOVERN, II
ERIC JAMES MCGOWAN
JAMES ARTHUR MCGRADY
JOHN MAURICE MCKEON, JR.
CHERYL DEANN MCKINNEY
BRADLEY KENNETH MCMILLIN
ROBERT LORIMER MCWILLIAM
NICHOLAS JOSEPH MELFI, III
CHARLES SUMNER MERRILL, IV
ROBERT ELWOOD METZ
WAYNE WILLIAM MIHAILOV
JOHN ROBERT MILES
DAVID ARTHUR MILLER
JOHN FRANCOIS MILLER
RAYMOND TROY MILLER
JOHN PAUL MILLMAN
JAMES MURAL MILLS, III
THOMAS JOSEPH MILLS
PETER ALAN MILNES
KENNETH MILVID, JR.
MICHAEL VINCENT MINEO
GEORGE ARTHUR MINICK
EFREN C. MOJICA, JR.
LUIS EMILIO MOLINA
ROBERTO LEONARDO MOLINA
GREGG JOSEPH MONTALTO
MARIO MANUEL MONTALVO
ANEL ANGEL MONTES
DAVID JAMES MONTGOMERY, II
RICHARD STIVERS MONTGOMERY
MICHAEL DAVID MOODY
JAMES EDWARD MOONIER, III
KENT WAYNE MOORE
SHIMON MOR
CHARLES DAVID MORGAN, JR.
WILLIAM MAURICE MORIARTY, JR.
RICHARD GRIFFIN MORRISON
MATTHEW ALEXANDER MORSE
JOEL EVAN MOSS
KWAME NKOSI MOULTRIE
CURTIS ALLEN MUELLER
THOMAS HAYWARD MULDROW, JR.
JEFFREY DAN MULKEY
CURT WILLIAM MULLER
MICHAEL DENNIS MULLOY
JEFFREY LAWRENCE MUNOZ
JAY ALBERT MURPHY
WILLIAM THOMAS MURRAY
VAL DONALD NAFTALI
GEORGE TERUHISA NAGATSUKA
WILLIAM ONEAL NASH, JR.
ANTHONY JOHN NAVE
BERNADETTE MARY NEGLIA
DOUGLAS CODET NELSON
MARK BALDWIN NELSON
GREGORY DAVID NEWKIRK
EUGENE THAISON NGUYEN
DEREK JUDE NISCO
ADAM HOWARD NOBLE

FRANCIS PETER NOTZ
CHRISTOPHER EDWARD NOVAK
KATHARINE JOANNA NOVAK
THOMAS DAVID NOVITSKE
DANIEL LEE NYENHUIS
JOSEPH ROBERT OBRIEN
MICHAEL GARRICK O'BRYAN, JR.
MAUREEN ERIN ODELL
JEFFREY ROBERT OETTLER
JOHN WILLIAM OLIVER, JR.
PETER MICHAEL OLSEN
KRISTI RENEE OLSON
KERRY LYNN ONEILL
ALAN EDWARD ORR, JR.
ERIK WILLIAM OSTROM
PAUL CHRISTOPHER OSTROWSKI
ROGER JAMES OUMET
SCOTT JOSEPH OVERBECK
RICHARD THOMAS OVERKAMP, JR.
BERNARD KENNEDY OWENS
ALFRED JOHN OWINGS, II
CARTER WILLIAM PAGE
JUNG YUL PAK
ANDREW FREDRICK PALM
JAMES BLAINE PARKERSON
TIMOTHY PAUL PARKS
STEPHEN ARON PARRA
PHILLIP ROMMEL PASCHER
ERIK RUSSELL PATTON
JASON ROBERT PAWLEY
MATTHEW JOHN PAWLKOWSKI
DONALD EUGENE PEACOCK, II
LEE DAVID PEARCE
GREGORY PAUL PEDERSON
LORI LYNN PERKINS
JOHN EDWARD PERRONE
BRIAN ROLAND PERRY
JON CROSBY PERRYMAN
JAMES HAROLD PERSHING
CHRISTIAN JURGEN PETERSON
WILLIAM ANDREW PETERSON
ROBERT ALLEN PETRICK
JOHN BRIAN PETROFF
JAMES BOHLING PFEIFFER
BO MINH QUANG KH PHAM
DOUGLAS MICHAEL PHELAN
KRISTIN MARIE PHELPS
DOUGLAS CHARLES PHILLIPS
WENDY KAY PHILLIPS
SEAN TIMOTHY PHINNEY
COLIN CRAIG PHIPPS
DANIELLE ANDREA PICCO
MICHAEL DAVID PIERCE
JASON LANDON PIKE
BRIAN LEE PILGER
TIMOTHY STEEL PIONE
FREDERICK WILLIAM PIQUETTE
RONALD JASON PIRET
DAVID ALAN PLISKE
THOMAS EDWARD PLOTT, II
ADAM MICHAEL PLUMPTON
PATRICK RONALD POLESINSKI
JAMES THOMAS POLICKOSKI
JOHN VERNON POOLE
STEVEN NIKOLAI POTOCHNIK
REZA POURAGHABAGHER
MICHAEL EDWARD PRALL
TONY ALEXANDER PRETE
JOSHUA DAVID PRICE
THOMAS JAMES PRIEUR
KARL FREDERICK PRIGGE
MATTHEW THOMAS PROVENCHER
JOHN THOMAS QUARLES
RICK MARSHALL RADONICH
GERALD JAYSON RAINES
JAMES ROY RAMIREZ
KARIN Y. RAO
PAUL MICHAEL RASMUS
WERNER JOHANN RAUCHENSTEIN, JR.
JAMES FRANKLIN RAUSCHER
ELIZABETH BELDEN RAVNDAL
MICHAEL JON REAGAN
TOBY ERIC REAM
CHAD BYRON REED
JEFFREY RAYMOND REGISTER
JOHN KENNETH REILLEY
MARK CHRISTOPHER REYES
JOHN MARK RHODES
ALBERT EVERETT RICE
JASON ALEXANDER RICH

JEREMY CHRISTOPHER RICH
JUSTIN BLAIR RICHARDS
BRIAN EDWARD RIES
GREGORY SCOTT RIVERA
STEVEN CARMINE
ROBERTO, JR.
BRUCE FRAZIER ROBINSON, JR.
JOHN PHILIP ROBINSON, III
MICHAEL PAUL ROBLES
BRAD WILLIAM ROCKWELL
BRADLEY MICHAEL RODI
ERICH PAUL ROETZ
STEVEN EDWARD
ROODZANT
ROBERT JOSEPH ROSALES
REY RAIL ROSS
GEOFFREY STERLING
ROYAL
MICHAEL JON RUBEL, JR.
JOHN CHARLES RUDELLA
JOHN PAUL HARRIS RUE
ANDREW MICHAEL RUIZ
SAMUEL CONRAD RUMPH, III
JOHN JOSEPH RUSNAK
JONATHAN CARL RUSSELL
GLEN EDWARD SABIN
JOHN PATRICK SAHLIN
GREGORY ALAN SAKRYD
MICHAEL SCOTT SALING
COLLEEN CHRIS SALONGA
DAVID MICHAEL SANFIELD
JOSEPH MICHAEL
SANTOMAURO, JR.
CATHERINE MENDOZA
SANTOS
DOUGLAS WILLIAM SASSE, III
AKANE SAUNDERS
SAMANTHA JULIA SAXTON
ANNE LORRAINE SAY
KIMBERLEY ELLEN
SCANGO
TIMOTHY ANDREW
SCHARCK
DAVID JOSEPH
SCHLESINGER
ANDREW DAVID SCHMIDT
KEVIN JAMES SCHMIDT
THOMAS DAVID SCHMIDT
MICHAEL ERIC SCHNEIDER
CYNTHIA ANN SCHOWE
JOHN PAUL SCHULTZ
KARL ULRICH SCHULTZ
SUSAN SCHWARTZ
JEFFREY MICHAEL SCOTT
RICHARD IRVIN
SCRITCHFIELD, JR.
MICHAEL SHEEHAN
SEEBERGER
DANIEL FRANKLIN
SEIDENSTICKER
DOUGLAS LEO SELF
GREGORY EUGENE
SELFIDGE
STEVEN MICHAEL SEOANE
SCOTT ROBERT SEYFARTH
DAVID KIMBER SHAFFER
JOHN FORREST SHARPE
JONATHAN JAMES SHIELDS
DANIEL MINSOK SHIN
KENNETH WAYNE
SHROPSHIRE, JR.
MAXWELL JENKINS
SHUMAN
ERIC WILLIAM SIEBERT
KEITH RICHARD SILINSKY
JUAN ALEJANDRO SILVA
TYREL TROY SIMPSON
MARY BETH SINES
THOMAS WADE SINGLETON
CHARLES WILLIAM SITES
BRIAN LYNN SITTLOW
VINCENT PATRICK SIVILLO
JOHN JAMES SKELLY
QUINN DAVID SKINNER
JAMES CARROLL SLAUGHT
RICHARD JAY SLAKES
KEVIN MICHAEL SMART
SCOTT DAVID SMART
DAVID MICHAEL SMITH
JACK GERARD SMITH
JOSEPH PATRICK SMITH
NATASHA LEIGH SMITH
OTIS BENTON SMITH, III
QUWAN ANTHONY SMITH
WALTER VINCENT SMITH
TIMOTHY BERNARD
SNEERINGER
CHESLEY DAVID SNIDER
CHAD CHRISTOPHER
SNYDER
CRAIG MATTHEW SNYDER
ROBERT MICHAEL
SOHOVICH
TROY ALLEN SOLBERG
DAVID MICHAEL SOUZA
MICHAEL TIPTON SPENCER

TIMOTHY CURTISS SPICER
BROCK ANDREW
SPRADLING
STEPHEN OWEN SPRAGUE
JAMES ROBERT SPRUNGLE, III
KAREN LYNN SRAV
BRUCE RICHARD STANLEY, JR.
JOSEPH MICHAEL STAUD
DAVID JOSEPH STAVISH
CHRISTOPHER JAMES
STERBIS
JOHN DAVENPORT
STEVENS
JONATHAN LYLE STILL
CHRISTOPHER TOBIAS
STILLEY
JULIE ANN STOPHA
THOMAS DANIEL STOREY
KEVIN JAY STROUD
JOHN MITCHELL
STUBBLEFIELD
MICHAEL DAVID STULL
WILLIAM ERIC SUBER
MICHAEL THUOC SULLIVAN
RICHARD JAMES SULLIVAN
MICHAEL PHILLIP
SUMMERS
CHRISTOPHER ANTHONY
SUMNER
SHAWN PATRICK SWEENEY
BRETT CAMERON SWEET
DOUGLAS LEE SWISHER
KEVIN CHRISTOPHER
TALBOT
BRIAN SALAMAT
TALICURAN
SHANE PATRICK TALLANT
JOHN TORIBIO TAN
PATRICK JOHN TANGNEY
MARK WARNER
TANKERSLEY
ANDREA ELIZABETH
TAPLIN
SCOTT THOMAS TAYLOR
AARON THOMAS TELLIER
CRAIG RONALD TESSIN
MATTHEW ALLEN
TESTERMAN
MATTHEW KIM THAYER
ROBERT SCOTT THOMAS
ROBERT SAMUEL
THOMPSON
JONATHAN MACGREGOR
THORP
JOHN ANTHONY TIERNEY
SHANNON JAMES TILLMAN
LUAN KIM TO
JEFFREY SCOTT TODD
JOHN DAVID TOIG
JAMES HUGH TOOLE
JOEL CLAY TRANHAM
ERNEST JOSEPH TRICHE, IV
SCOTT STEPHEN TROYER
JEFFREY JAMES TRUITT
GEORGE NICHOLAS
TSANGARIS
CHRISTIAN MATTHEW
TULODIESKI
KYLE TRAVIS TURCO
CHRISTOPHER ANDREW
TURKOVICH
MEGHAN ISINGARD TUTTLE
KENNETH ARDONA UBIAL
ANDREW FRANK ULAK
STACIA AGNES ULISSEY
TIMOTHY MARK ULMER
LOURDES PATRICIA
VALLAZZA
CHRISTOPHER LAWRENCE
VALLHONRAT
EDWARD MORRIS VAN
BUREN, IV
JACK RONALD VAN NATTA
COURTNEY LEE VAN
SCHOONEVELD
TODD DOUGLAS
VANDEGRIFT
MARK ALEXANDER
VANNOY
FRANK MICHAEL
VERDUCCI, JR.
JOHN REVI RAMOS VIDENA
CYNTHIA DOMINGO
VIERNES
OLIVER RANDOLPH VIETOR
LILLIAN LYNN VILLEMMEZ
FREDRICK SALVATORE
VINCENTO
MEGAN JEAN WAGGONER
WILLIAM ROBERT
WAGGONER
MATTHEW LYNN WAGLE
DENNIS JAMES WAGNER
CHAD GORDON WAHLIN
JAMES ROY WAIS, JR.
GARY ALAN WALKER
ARTHER WILLIAM
WALLACE, JR.
TANYA LYNN WALLACE

BRYAN EDWARD
WALTHALL
CHARLES FREDERICK
WALZ, IV
KJELL ANDREW WANDER
JASON DAVID WARTTLE
TODD ANDREW WASHBURN
JASON THOMAS WATHEN
MATTHEW IAN WEBER
ROBERT WILLIAM
WEDERTZ
TODD SINCLAIR WEEKS
GLENN ALAN WEIDNER, II
ROBERT AARON WEIS
MATTHEW HUNTER WELSH
CURTIS LEONUS WESLEY, JR.
THOMAS WAYNE WESLEY
DEREK SCOTT WESSMAN
SCOTT RICHARD WHALEN
BEAUREGARD MOSELEY
WHITE
BENJAMIN WOODRIFFE
WHITE
DAVID GLENN WHITEHEAD
RICHARD STEFAN
WHITELEY
JEFFREY JENNINGS
WHITEWAY

JOSEPH ARTHUR WIENDL, IV
CLIFFORD TODD WIESE
ANDREW GREGORY
WILLIAMS
CLAY GARRETT WILLIAMS
ERNIE S. WILLIAMS
JEREMY BOONE WILLIAMS
EDWARD JOSEPH WILLS
CHEYENNE DANIEL WILSON
ERIC STEVEN WINTER
JONATHAN REDDING WISE
MICHAEL TRENT
WOLFERSBERGER
EUGENE MATTHEW
WOODRUFF
GEOFFREY AUSTIN WRIGHT
WALTER CLARK WRYE, IV
THOMAS PETER WYPYSKI
JEFFREY BOYD YATES
LUIS ENRIQUE YEPEZ, JR.
CHRISTOPHER PAUL YORK
LAURENCE MARTIN YOUNG
PATRICK EARL YOUNG
JOSEPH JOOHO YUN
KURT JACOB ZAHNEN
TIFFANY MARIE ZALLNICK
MATTHEW DAVID ZERPHY
MICHAEL FREDERICK ZINK

TODD P. RAMPEY
WILLIAM P. RAYFIELD
NORMAN L. REITTER
MATTHEW B. REUTER
BENJAMIN P. RICHMOND
ERIC J. ROPELLA
DOUGLAS J. SABER
SASAN K. SABET
KURT J. SCHERRER
PETER K. SCHEFFELBEIN
RICHARD A. SCHILKE
PAUL M. SCHIMPF
JAMES A. SCHNELLE
ROBERT W. SCHRODER
JOSEPH R. SCHUYLER
SAMUEL S. SCIALABBA
MARK W. SEDWICK
MATTHEW K. SEIPT
CHARLES P. SMITH
COLIN D. SMITH
SAMUEL H. SMITH
DAVID R. SMULLEN
MICHAEL J. SOBOKOWSKI
JEFFREY T. STEVENSON
FARRELL J. SULLIVAN
DAVID E. TANDY

JONATHAN P. TAYLOR
MICHAEL C. TAYLOR
KEVIN G. TEHAN
MONTE D. TEN KLEY
PERRY F. TOWNSEND
JOHN TURNER
TROY J. TURNER
DAVID A. VAVASSEUR
LUIS E. VILLALOBOS
JASON E. WALDRON
JOHN R. WALLACE
MATTHEW S. WALTERS
AUSTIN WANG
WALTER T. WEATHERS
THOMAS A. WELBORN
MARK WELCH
MICHAEL P. WENTZ
JACOB J. WIEBE
DAVID H. WILLIAMS
GREGORY J. WILSON
DEVIN A. WINKLOSKY
CRAIG C. WIRTH
JAY D. WYLLIE
JOHN W. YARGER
CHARLES W. YOUNG
JAY K. ZOLLMANN

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED U.S. MARINE CORPS RESERVE OFFICERS, WHO ARE NAVAL ACADEMY GRADUATES, TO BE APPOINTED PERMANENT SECOND LIEUTENANTS IN THE U.S. MARINE CORPS, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, U.S. CODE, SECTION 531:

UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS CONFIRMATION LIST

To be second lieutenant

ARNOUX ABRAHAM
LODGERIO B. ALQUEZA
EDWARD W. BALET
JOHN B. BARRANCO, JR.
ARA E. BARTON
SHAWN A. BASIL
DANIEL T. BAULIG
CLAY A. BEARDI
PAUL G. BERNSTEIN
CHARLES T. BERRY
BRIAN R. BLAYLOCK
ANTHONY C. BOLDEN
MATTHEW H. BOWER
BENJAMIN J. BROWN
HENRY D. BROWN
JULIE L. BROWN
TERRANCE M. BROWN
WILLIAM I. BROWN
STEFAN T.
BRUNNSCHWEILER
JUSTIN BUTTERS
CARLOS A. CALERO
JOHN R. CAMPBELL
ROBERT S. CARNEVALE
CLIFTON B. CARPENTER
CHRISTOPHER G. CATLIN
MICHAEL A. CESTA
GEORGE C. CHATLOS
WINFIELD E. CHECKLEY
MICHAEL M. CHO
CHRISTOPHER L. CLARK
GARY A. CLEMENT
LAWRENCE C. COLEMAN
DOUGLAS L. CONSTANT
SCOTT E. CONWAY
SCOTT A. COOPER
SHOGO J. COTTRELL
LONNIE L. CRAWFORD
AARON L. CRESPIN
JUSTIN C. CREVIER
JAMES D. DEEN
STEVEN J. DELAZARO
WILLIAM L. DEPUPE
THOMAS M. DOBBINS
PETER M. DOUGHTY
JEFFREY J. DURDIN
BRIAN M. DWYER
ERIK B. ELDRIDGE
JAMES B. ELLIS
JAMES E. ERWIN
CHRISTOPHER R.
ESCAMILLA
JOHN R. EWING
KELLY A. FAGAN
ROBERT J. FAILS
ROBERT W. FALKENBACH
KEVIN M. FARRINGTON
ANDREW T. FITZPATRICK
GRACE S. GEE
PHILLIP M. GORDON
THOMAS D. GORE
CHRISTOPHER T. GRAVES
JEREMY L. GRAY
MICHAEL E. GREENE
MICHAEL E. GROTH
TERRY D. HAGEN
JON L. HALVERSON
TERRANCE E. HAND
CASEY E. HANNIGAN
KEVIN C. HARRIS

ERIC L. HERNANDEZ
WINSTON A. HERON
JON S. HETLAND
KARL E. HILL
STEVEN J. HIMELSPACH
PATRICK R. HITTLE
AARON B. HOLLAND
ADAM Y. HOLTON
DANIEL J. HOUTING
MIKEL R. HUBER
WINSTON G. JIMENEZ
CALEB L. JONES
ROBERT J. KARCZEWSKI
THOMAS M. KARN
MATTHEW G. KELLY
WILLIAM S. KOHMUENCH
MATTHEW J. KOLICH
GEORGE L. KOROL
BRENT L. LARSON
WALTER S. LEE
MARGERY A. LEGGETT
ANDREW T. LEHMANN
BRANDON K. LEWIS
TYSON C. LEWIS
RAUL LIANEZ
JASON G. LINLEY
JASON R. MADDOCKS
SHAWN E. MANSFIELD
JON G. MARTIN
ANTHONY J. MARUCCI
JOSEPH E. MAYBACH
TODD L. MCCAULEY
WILLIAM E. MCCULLLEY
PATRICK S. MCDONIEL
MARK N. MCGINNIS
MARIA S. MCMILLEN
CHESTER MCMILLON
EDWARD D. MCNULTY
CHARLES F. MEGOWN
DAVID M. MIKKOLA
RO T. MILANETTE
AARON J. MILES
PAUL W. MILLER
CHARLES D. MINIFIE
JACOB N. MITCHELL
MICHAEL S. MOLLOHAN
JOSEPH L. MORENO
ROBERT L. MOSKAL
JAMES D. MURPHY
JOHN C. NEIDIGH
CHANDLER S. NELMS
BRYAN P. OLEARY
JOHN C. OSBORNE
THOMAS R. OWENBY
VAUGHN M. PANGELINAN
BRYAN E. PATTERSON
ERIC A. PECK
JULIE A. PELTON
MARK W. PETERS
RICHARD E. PETERSEN
ROBERT S. PETERSON
DARRELL W. PLATZ
JOHN R. POLIDORO
JAMES A. PRITCHETT
THOMAS L. PRITCHETT
BRIAN C. PROCTOR
MICHAEL A. PURCELL
JAMES T. QUANN
SEAN P. QUIGLEY
SARAH R. QUIMBY

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate September 7, 1993:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

M. JOYCELYN ELDERS, OF ARKANSAS, TO BE MEDICAL DIRECTOR IN THE REGULAR CORPS OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE, SUBJECT TO QUALIFICATIONS THEREFOR AS PROVIDED BY LAW AND REGULATIONS, AND TO BE SURGEON GENERAL OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE, FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

THE ABOVE NOMINATION WAS APPROVED SUBJECT TO THE NOMINEE'S COMMITMENT TO RESPOND TO REQUESTS TO APPEAR AND TESTIFY BEFORE ANY DULY CONSTITUTED COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE.

WITHDRAWALS

Executive messages transmitted by the President to the Senate on September 7, 1993, withdrawing from further Senate consideration the following nominations:

IN THE NAVY

THE NOMINATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES NAVY MIDSHIPMEN NAMED HEREIN FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADES OF ENSIGN WHICH WERE SENT TO THE SENATE ON 24 MAY 1993.

NAVAL ACADEMY MIDSHIPMEN

To be ensign; permanent

AARNES, ROBERT BRADLEY
ADRIANO, PHILLIP
MICHAEL
ALBEA, LEOPOLDO
SARDALLA JR.
ALFONZO, BRENT ADDISON
ALLEE, JASON YANAR
ALLEYNE, JASON
CHRISTOPHER
ALOISIO, ANDREW ALAN
ALTAMAR, ESTRADA
HERNAN ORLANDO
ALTHOFF, HEIDI MARIE
ALVAREZ, CHRISTOPHER
CHAD
AMOS, MICHAEL TIMOTHY
ANDERSEN, KEVIN WARREN
ANDERSON, JAMES
ARTHUR
ANDERSON, JENNIFER
LYNN
ANDREWS, JUSTIN
PATRICK
ANDUZE, ERIC JOSE
ANZELONE, DARREN
RAYMOND
ARNALDO, EDGAR FABILA
ARNESON, TODD ROBERT
ARNOLD, MATTHEW DAVID
ARNONE, JAIMESON
JOSEPH
ARNY, MATTHEW LINDH
ARTHUR, RICHARD
CHARLES
ARTZ, GARRETT
CHRISTOPHER
ASH, BENJAMIN JESSE
ASHBY, DAVID
HERRINGTON
ASPENSON, ARLEN
EDWARD
ATHA, ROBERT JOSE JR.
AUSTIN, KEVIN LOUIS
BACH, ERIC JOSEF
BADGLEY, KATHERINE
LOUISE
BAILEY, EUGENE RAYMOND
BAJOR, LAURA ANN
BAKER, ANTHONY POWER
BAKER, DOUGLAS CONAN
BALTES, JOHN ANTHONY
BARON, JONATHAN
BAUTISTA
BARR, JEFFREY ISAAC
BARTHEL, ROBERT
VINCENT
BARTISH, JOSEPH WILLIAM
IV
BARTLE, WILLIAM ANDREW
BAXTER, DANIEL VERNON
BAYLESS, JOHN ALLEN
BEAUFATT, CHRISTOPHER
STUART
BECK, CHRISTOPHER
THOMAS
BEITER, DAVID GEORGE
BELL, STEPHEN JOSH
BENDER, BRIAN CHARLES
BENNETT, JASON HORST
BENWAY, AARON DEWAYNE
BERNHARD, JEFFREY ALAN
BERNSTEIN, PAUL
GREGORY
BERRYMAN, ROBERT
MOGABAB
BISHOP, STEPHEN
ANTHONY
BLALOCK, BRIAN ROBERT
BLANTON, JAMES BRETT
BLOCK, JAMEY JOHN
BLOOM, JOEY MARGUERITE
BLOSSEY, DAMIAN SENNEL
BLUNT, MATHEW ROY
BOEDEKER, SCOTT ALLEN
BOHN, JAMES BRITTON
BOLDEN, ANTHONY CHE

BOONE, JOHN DANIEL
BOONE, MICHAEL JAMES
BORGHARDT, JAMES
PATRICK MARSH
BOROS, JEFFREY SCOTT
BORUSHKO, DAVID
WILLIAM
BOSS, JAMES RICHARD
BOURDON, TIMOTHY ERIC
BOWSER, COLIN ANDREW
BOYKIN, KEVIN PAGE
BOZZELLI, JOSEPH PHILIP
BRADY, BRADY ADAMS
BRAND, HEATHER DAVIS
BRASWELL, MICHAEL
TIMOTHY, JR.
BRAUN, JONATHAN
WILLIAM
BRAUN, ROBERT JAMES
BRENDEN, ERIC JASON
BRETT, MICHELE MARIE
BRETZ, DAVID ALLEN
BRIDGES, DAMIAN
HOLLAND
BRIDGMAN, WALTER
ELMER, III
BRILL, STEPHANIE
MICHELLE
BRODIE, ROBERT DONALD
BROWN, CHRISTOPHER
TERENCE
BROWN, JAMES EDWARD
BROWNLEE, KARY NIKOLAI
BRUCHOK, BRET RYAN
BRUNS, ERIC THOMAS
BULL, JERRY MICHAEL
BULJAT, BRYAN JOSEPH
BURBAGE, KRISTIN
MICHELLE
BURD, MICHAEL LOUIS
BURGOS, COLVERT
PEGOLLO
BURK, THEODORE MICHAEL
BURKE, BRIAN JOHN
BUTLER, RICHARD ALAN
BUTLER, TODD ANDREW
BYRD, JAMES HARRISON, JR.
BYRNE, KEVIN PATRICK
CACERES, MARCELLO
DOMINIC
CALLAHAN, SCOTT NELSON
CAMERON, GREGORY
CAMPBELL, JOHN ROBERT
CAMPBELL, KYLE RICHARD
CAOLA, RANSEN JULES, JR.
CARADONA, KEVIN NOEL
CARLSON, MARC GEORGE
CARMAN, ARON SHEA
CARPENTER, ALBERTA
CAMACHO
CARPENTER, JEFFREY
LEONARD
CARTER, MARK GLENN
CASPER, ROBERT ALFRED, JR.
CASSIDY, CHRISTOPHER
JOHN
CATALANO, ANGELO
NICHOLAS
CATLIN, CHRISTOPHER
GEORGE
CATTLER, DAVID
MATTHEW
CAVANAUGH
CHRISTOPHER JAMES
CHACKO, JACOB ANDREW
CHADWICK, JONATHAN
LYONS
CHANG, DANIEL KIWHAN
CHAPMAN, GREGORY
FREDERICK
CHAPPELL, COLEY
CLINTON
CHARON, GUZMAN FELIPE
ROBERTO
CHATTFIELD, DENISE LEIGH
CHESSE, ROBERT
LAWRENCE
CHILBERT, CHRISTOPHER
JOSEPH
CHOATE, MICHAEL CASEY
CHRISTOPHERSON, RYAN
GUST
CIZEK, CHRISTOPHER
JAMES
CLARK, JOSEPH MICHAEL, JR.
CLOYD, MICHAEL JAMES
COBB, RELMOND BENNETT
COCHRAN, BRYAN MICHAEL
COLLIER, JAMES DOUGLAS
CONKLIN, JEFFREY SCOTT
CONNELLY, NORA
CATHLEEN
CONTRERAS, SALVADOR, III
CONVERSE, CHARLES
LEANDER
CONZEN, ERIC LAURENCE
COOPER, GEORGE HUBERT
CORRAO, PETER ANTHONY, JR.

CORREIA, BERNARD
ANTHONY, III
COTTRELL, SHOHO JOHN
COX, JOSEPH LLOYD, IV
CRAWFORD, MARK ALBERT
CRAWFORD, TIMOTHY
MARTIN
CRECELIOUS, FREDERICK
EARL
CRONYN, DENNIS QUIGLEY
CROSS, DEVAN JOHN
NAPOLSON
CRUZ, ANNA CIELITO
CULLER, KRISTEN
WILLIAMS
CULVER, CORY LYNN
CUMMINGS, JAMES COLIN
CUSHMAN, WILLIAM GENE
DACHOS, SARAH ANN
DAGUE, CHRISTOPHER
MATTHEW
DALTON, RUTH ANNETTE
DALY, WILLIAM ROCKWELL
DANIELS, ERIC ROBIN
DANKO, ANDREW DANIEL
DAVIDSON, BRAD BEHRING
DAVIES, HEATHER LYNN
DAVIS, JEFFREY SCOTT
DAVIS, RICHARD STUART
DAVITT, SCOTT ALBERT
DEGENER, DANIEL MICHAEL
DEHAN, KENNETH DONALD
DELANTY, STEPHEN JOHN
DELARODERIE, JAMES
ALDRICH
DELCASTILLO, ALEXANDER
JOHN
DEMOS, STEVEN HARLOW
DENTON, LARRY GENE JR.
DENTON, ROBERT III
DEWALT, RALPH
FREDERICK II
DIBELLA, BRENDON
THOMAS
DICKSON, BRIEN WAYNE
DICKLOCKER, TED ERIC
DOBBS, PHILLIP STEPHAN
DOLING, STEPHEN FRANCIS
DONE, TRAVIS BARRY
DONNELLY, BRAD PATRICK
DORHAM, ELLIOTT TODD
DORRIAN, HUGH JOSEPH II
DOUGHTY, PETER MICHAEL
DRAEGER, JEFFREY JAMES
DRAHEIM, DEBRA ANN
DRAYTON, KIMBERLYN
MICHELE
DROBNY, MARC EDWARD
DRYER, JAY EDWARD
DUDLEY, TERENCE LLOYD
DUDLEY, TODD
CHRISTOPHER
DUFOUR, PETER RAYMOND
DUNAWAY, MATTHEW
CHARLES
DUNCAN, DAVID FIELD
EARL, MICHAEL GEORGE
ECKERT, DANIEL
GEOFFREY
EGAN, ROBERT VINCENT
EGGERS, JEFFREY
WILLIAM
ELIAS, JAMES JOSEPH
ELLIOTT, CARLTON
THOMAS
ELLISON, THOMAS
SCOTCHMER II
ELLSWORTH, HAROLD
ALAN
ENGLE, PHILIP LEE JR.
ENGLISH, JOSHUA GARY
ENNS, GEOFFREY ALAN
ESLICH, ERIK JAMES
ESPIRITU, DANILO
AFORQUEJR
EUBANKS, KELLY ANN
FACTOR, DOUGLAS AARON
FALLON, GREGORY
MICHAEL
FALZONE, MARIA DENISE
FANJUL, JUAN ANDRES
FARRAR, ERIC CLAYTON
FARRIN, MICHAEL GERARD
FAVETTI, MICHAEL DAVID
FAXIO, JOHN ANDREW
FEDERAL, ROBERT KEEGAN
III
FEENEY, MATTHEW
ROBERT
FENTON, MICHAEL EDWIN
FERGUSON, JOHN HARLAN
FERGUSON, KENNETH LEE
FERNANDEZ, MARK
JOSEPH
FETTER, BRYAN JAMES
FIEST, LESLEY JOHN
FIERCE, NACIM ROBERT
FINNEY, MATTHEW DAVID
FIORE, NICHOLAS JAMES
FITCHETT, BENJAMIN
THOMAS
FIVAS, MICHAEL WILLIAM

FLATLEY, MICHAEL SEAN
FLORES, JORGE RICARDO
FLYNN, KEVIN ANDREW
FOGARTY, JEFFREY
JOSEPH
FONTAINE, ERIC NEIL
FORAKER, JOSEPH CARL III
FOX, MICHAEL AARON
FRANKLIN, SUSANNE
MARIE
FRATUS, RICK JOHN
FRICKER, KURT
ENGELBERT
FRITSCH, JAMES EDWARD
JR.
FULLER, WARDELL
CONRAD
FULLERTON, BRETT
THOMAS
FUTCH, GEORGE GREGORY
GAGNON, TODD ALAN
GALLAGHER, MICHAEL
PATRICK
GALLAGHER, TIMOTHY
JAMES
GALLMAN, GREGORY
FRANCIS
GALLUS, DAVID PAUL
GARCIA, FERNANDO
GARCIA, JOANNA LEE
GARCIA, KATHA
GARNER, LINDA MARIE
GARWOOD, CASEY
CHARLES
GEE, GRACE SUNGYN
GENUALDI, MARC ANTHONY
GERACE, MELISSA JOAN
GIBBONS, ANDREW SHAWN
GILLES, ANTHONY
FRANCIS
GISH, LYNN ANDREW
GLENN, J. SEARGEANT
GLOVER, ANTHONY SCOTT
GLOVER, DAVID BURTON
GO, DAL HO
GOLDHAMMER, FREDERIC
CARL
GONZALEZ, ISAAC NMN
GOOCH, SCOTT BRIAN
GOODSON, ROBERT
FRANKLIN II
GORDON, JOHN JOSEPH
GORDY, KYLE PACE
GRASDOCK, WAYNE
GERALD
GRAUERHOLZ, MARIA
LOUISE
GRAVITT, MICHAEL JAMES
GRAY, CHAD ROBERTS
GRAY, JEREMY LEE
GREENE, AARON
TIMBERLAKE
GREENE, DANIEL EUGENE
GREENSPAN, MARCUS
CHRISTOPHER
GREMILLION, JOHN DAVID
GRESHAM, BRADLEY
MAURICE
GRIESE, KENNETH
JOSEPH
GRIFITH, NOEL MICHAEL
JR.
GRILONE, CHRISTOPHER
KIM CHON
GROH, JOHN REYNOLDS III
GROHE, EDWIN JOHN JR.
GROSSMAN, ADAM BRETT
GUDUKAS, TIMOTHY
SHAWN
GUERIN, RICHARD CORRY
GUNTHER, WAYNE
DOUGLAS
HAASE, JOHN DIETRICH
HABERMA, STEPHEN
CHARLES
HAGEN, ORLOFF LARS
RAYMOND
HAHN, STEPHANIE ANNE
HALL, DENNIS RAY JR.
HALLER, DANIEL JOSEPH
HAMMOND, JASON GRAY
HAND, TERRANCE EUGENE
HANGER, WILLIAM JESSE
HANLEY, TIMOTHY JOHN
HANSEN, PHILLIP EDWARD
HANSHAW, HEATH LAMAR
HANSON, CHRISTOPHER
JOHN
HANSON, KEVIN KARL
HARDING, CHRISTOPHER
GAVIN
HARRIS, BRIAN JAMES
HARSHMAN, GLENN
RUSSELL
HASENBANK, MONTY LANE
HATOK, ANTHONY JOHN JR.
HAWN, ERIC JAMES
HAWVER, JOHN WILLIAM
HAYNES, ERNEST EDWARD
III
HEAD, ALBON ONEAL III
HELLMANN, JOHN ANDREW

HENDERSON, JAMES ALAN
HENDRIX, RAY MARVIN JR.
HERN, ALAN MICHAEL
HERON, WINSTON ANTHONY
JR.
HERRERA, PATRICK LEE
HEYNE, GERALD TODD
HIDALGO, TURHAN ISMAEL
HILL, JEFFREY BRIAN
HILL, KARL EDWARD
HITTLE, PATRICK RUSSELL
HOBBS, ALLEN LEE
HOEFT, KELLY JEANNE
HOFSTEDT, TODD ALDEN
HOGAN, JOHN JOSEPH JR.
HOLLAND, STEPHEN BRUCE
HOLZRICHTER, MARK
FREDRICK
HONEYCUTT, BRANDON
ALAN
HOOPER, WADE HAMILTON
HOPKINS, JOHN WAYNE JR.
HOUSE, JULIE ANN
HOWARD, ROBERT THOMAS
HOWELL, MONROE MARTIN
II
HOWES, CORY RICHARD
HSU, MICHAEL MING HUA
HUBBARD, GREGORY
WRIGHT
HUNTINGTON, DOUGLAS
CHARLES
HURD, BRYAN ERIC
HUSSEY, JOHN FREEMAN
III
HYDE, MATTHEW PALMER
IMBLUM, MARK AARON
INGRAM, DARRELL BRIAN
IRETON, JOSEPH PATRICK
JR.
ISMA, DAVID KERINGER
ITAKURA, MICHAEL KAZUO
JACK, JASON HILLARY
JACKSON, STEPHEN
JOSHUA
JAKUBOWSKI, JASON ERIC
JANA, OMAR ELIAS
JEFFRIES, WILLIAM
WORTHINGTON
JENKINS, BYRON WADE
JENSEN, GENTRY WADE
JENSEN, JON LIAN
JEWETT, WILLIAM HENRY
III
JOHNSON, CHARLES ADLER
JR.
JOHNSON, DAVID ROBERT
JOHNSON, NOEL PATRICK
JOHNSON, TIMOTHY ALVIN
JOHNSON, VINCENT
RICHARD
JOHNSON, WILLIAM
SPENCER
JONES, CORINNE RILEY
JONES, DAVID STEWART
JONES, JOHN FRANCIS
JOYNER, MICHAEL
PROCTOR
JURGEMEYER, JEFFREY
ALLEN
JURUTKA, BRIAN RICHARD
KAIT, THOMAS CHARLES JR.
KANE, WILLIAM RICHARD
KARIN, RONALD JAMES JR.
KEANE, PATRICK MICHAEL
KECK, DANIEL JOHN
KEITH, MICHAEL PATRICK
KELLER, GREGORY BRIAN
KELLHER, SEAN GLEN
KELLY, RICHARD
MCCULLOUGH
KEMBALL, COOK KENNETH
MATTHEW
KENDRICK, WILLIAM
ANDREW
KENNARD, JOHN DAVID
KENNEY, W. PAUL III
KENNY, KARI ANN
KERLEY, LUCAS WAYNE
KERR, CALEB ALAN
KEWAK, KENDRA LEE
KIICK, DAVID MICHAEL
KILLACKY, JOHN PATRICK
KIM, ROY SUNG JOON
KIMSEY, ANDREW JAMES
KINCAID, RICHARD
WILLIAM
KINDER, TYPHANIE ANNE
KING, JEFFREY THOMAS
KING, STEVEN MORRIS
KINKEAD, BRADLEY LEE
KINSELLA, KELLY
SUZANNE
KINSMAN, DEAN RICHARD
KINTZLEY, KEITH RUSSELL
KIPP, CHRISTOPHER JON
KISS, ANDREW ALEXANDER
KLEIN, KEVIN JOHN
KLIEMANN, DAVID
WILLIAM
KNOLL, JAMES ANDREW
KNOX, WILLIAM KARL

KOLLAR, GEORGE MARTIN
KONKOLY, STEVEN
THOMAS
KOPP, TAKU
KOROL, GEORGE LEO JR.
KOVENSKY, SETH
KOZUB, MICHAEL DAVID
KRAFT, SCOTT HUDSON
KRAUSE, JEFFREY KEITH
JR.
KRAWCZYK, KIRSTEN
MICHELE
KRISTICK, JEFFREY EISEN
KROEGER, KAREN SUE
KROT, MICHAEL
SALVATORE
KRUEGER, KENNETH
ALFRED
KUBERSKI, ROBERT
KENNETH JR.
KUCHLER, RYAN JAMES
KUHN, MICHAEL ALAN
LABONTE, MATTHEW ALYN
LAMORIE, ANDREW DENIS
LAND, JOHN WATSON
LANDIS, JAMES
ELLSWORTH
LANTIER, BRIAN
CHRISTOPHER
LANTZ, SCOTT EDWARD
LARGES, CHAD MICHAEL
LARSEN, DAVID ARNOLD
LARSON, ANDREA
SHEFFIELD
LARSON, CRAIG ROBERT
LASALLE, DEVIN TODD
LEAR, MATTHEW RICHARD
LEDIG, SCOTT HAROLD
LEE, RICHARD SHANNON
LEE, STEVEN SCOP
LEHMAN, PATRICK ROBERT
LENART, JAMES ALAN
LESKOVICH, JOHN ROBERT
LEWIS, ANDREA LAURIE
LEWIS, CHRIS WALTER
LINDENBERG, ANDREA
LOUISE
LINDFORS, ERIC CARTER
LINK, HOWARD BRIAN JR.
LINTON, SHAWN GARRETT
LOBNER, MATTHEW
KNEELAND
LOFTUS, KIRK JAMES
LOHMAN, ROBERT MAX JR.
LOPEZ, JULIA MARGARET
LORD, TIFFANY LYNN
LOUGHMAN, DANIEL
WILLIAM
LOWELL, JAMES PAUL
LOWERY, JOHN LEE
LUKSI, LANCE JOEL
LUONGO, FRANK JOSEPH
MAAS, BRADLEY FRAZER
MACDONALD, JONATHAN
DAVID
MACENAS, GERALD JOHN II
MACHARG, JON TILSTON
MACIAS, VICTOR RUBEN
MADDOCKS, JASON ROBERT
MADRID, JOSEPH THOMAS
MAIER, STEVEN ROBERT
MANG, CHRISTOPHER NOEL
MANNO, MARK MATTHEW
MARCIANO, RAYMOND II
MARCOTT, STACY ANN
MARSH, CHRISTOPHER
DAVID
MARSH, JAMES JOHN V
MARSH, RUSSELL EUGENE
MARSHALL, MEL LING
AMOY
MARTIN, CHRISTY ANNE
MARTINEZ, MICHAEL
ANTHONY
MASCUNANA, JEFFERY
WARREN
MASON, JAMES WOODROW
MASSIE, RICHARD NEIL
MATTHEWS, STEVEN JOHN
MATZKO, JAY ALAN
MAYBACH, JOSEPH
EDWARD
MAYER, TANYA GOODEN
MBUTHIA, ARTHUR GITAU
MCANDREW, SHAUN
COLLEEN
MCAVOY, ERIN ANDREA
MCCALL, JAMES ARTHUR
III
MCCLELLAN, SCOTT DAVID
MCCLOSKEY, KEVIN
JOSEPH
MCCOOL, WAYNE WILLIAM
MCCORD, MICHAEL AARON
MCCORMICK, ROBERT
ALLEN JR.
MCGEE, MELANIE CLAIRE
MCGILL, WILLIAM JR.
MCGOVERN, PATRICK
JOSEPH II
MCGOWAN, ERIC JAMES
MCGRADY, JAMES ARTHUR

MCKEON, JOHN MAURICE
JR.
MCKINNEY, CHERYL DEANN
MCMILLIN, BRADLEY
KENNETH
MCMILLAN, ROBERT
LORIMER
MELFI, NICHOLAS JOSEPH
III
MERRILL, CHARLES
SUMNER IV
METZ, ROBERT ELWOOD
MHAILEW, WAYNE
WILLIAM
MILANETTE, RO THOMAS
MILES, AARON JON
MILES, JOHN ROBERT
MILLER, DAVID ARTHUR
MILLER, JOHN FRANCOIS
MILLER, MATTHEW
PATRICK
MILLER, RAYMOND TROY
MILLMAN, JOHN PAUL
MILLS, JAMES MURAL III
MILLS, THOMAS JOSEPH
MILNES, PETER ALAN
MILVID, KENNETH JR.
MINEO, MICHAEL VINCENT
MINICK, GEORGE ARTHUR
MOJICA, EFREN C JR.
MOLINA, LUIS EMILIO
MOLINA, ROBERTO
LEONARDO
MONTALTO, GREGG JOSEPH
MONTALVO, MARIO
MANUEL
MONTES, ANEL ANGEL
MONTGOMERY, DAVID
JAMES II
MONTGOMERY, RICHARD
STIVERS
MOODY, MICHAEL DAVID
MOONIER, JAMES EDWARD
III
MOORE, KENT WAYNE
MOR, SHIMON
MORGAN, CHARLES DAVID
JR.
MORIARTY, WILLIAM
MAURICE JR.
MORRISON, RICHARD
GRIFFEN
MORSE, MATTHEW
ALEXANDER
MOSS, JOEL EVAN
MOUTRIE, KWAME NKOSI
MUELLER, CURTIS ALLEN
MULDROW, THOMAS
HAYWARD JR.
MULKEY, JEFFREY DAN
MULLER, KURT WILLIAM
MULLOY, MICHAEL DENNIS
MUNOZ, JEFFREY
LAWRENCE
MURPHY, JAY ALBERT
MURRAY, WILLIAM
THOMAS
NAFTALI, VAL DONALD
NAGATSUKA, GEORGE
TERUHISA
NASH, WILLIAM ONEAL JR.
NAYE, ANTHONY JOHN
NEGLIA, BERNDETTE
MARY
NELMS, CHANDLER
NELSON, DOUGLAS CODET
NELSON, MARK BALDWIN
NEWKIRK, GREGORY DAVID
NGUYEN, EUGENE THAI SON
NISCO, DEREK JUDE
NOBLE, ADAM HOWARD
NOTZ, FRANCIS PETER
NOVAK, CHRISTOPHER
EDWARD
NOVAK, KATHARINE
JOANNA
NOVITSKE, THOMAS DAVID
NYENHUIS, DANIEL LEE
OBRIEN, JOSEPH ROBERT
OBRYAN, MICHAEL
GARRICK JR.
ODELL, MAUREEN ERIN
ODMAN, SCOTT ANDREW
OETTLE, JEFFREY ROBERT
OLIVER, JOHN WILLIAM JR.
OLSEN, PETER MICHAEL
OLSON, KRISTI RENEE
ONEILL, KERRY LYNN
ORR, ALAN EDWARD JR.
OSTROM, ERIK WILLIAM
OSTROWSKI, PAUL
CHRISTOPHER
OUMET, ROGER JAMES
OVERBECK, SCOTT JOSEPH
OVERKAMP, RICHARD
THOMAS JR.
OWENS, BERNARD
KENNEDY
OWINGS, ALFRED JOHN II
PAGE, CARTER WILLIAM
PAK, JUNG YUL
PALM, ANDREW FREDRICK

PARKERSON, JAMES
BLAINE
PARKS, TIMOTHY PAUL
PARRA, STEPHEN ARON
PASCHIEL, PHILLIP
ROMMEL
PATTON, ERIK RUSSELL
PAWLEY, JASON ROBERT
PAWLKOWSKI, MATTHEW
JOHN
PEACOCK, DONALD EUGENE
II
PEARCE, LEE DAVID
PEDERSON, GREGORY PAUL
PERKINS, LORI LYN
PERRONE, JOHN EDWARD
PERRY, BRIAN ROLAND
PERRYMAN, JON CROSBY
PERSHING, JAMES HAROLD
PETERSON, CHRISTIAN
JURGEN
PETRICK, ROBERT ALLEN
PETROFF, JOHN BRIAN
PFEIFFER, JAMES BOHLING
PHAM, BO MINH QUANG KH
PHELAN, DOUGLAS
MICHAEL
PHELPS, KRISTIN MARIE
PHILLIPS, DOUGLAS
CHARLES
PHILLIPS, WENDY KAY
PHINNEY, SEAN TIMOTHY
PHIPPS, COLIN CRAIG
PICCO, DANIELLE ANDREA
PIERCE, MICHAEL ANDREW
PIERCE, MICHAEL DAVID
PIKE, JASON LANDON
PILGER, BRIAN LEE
PIONE, TIMOTHY STEEL
PIQUETTE, FREDERICK
WILLIAM
PIRET, RONALD JASON
PLATZ, DARRELL WILLIAM
ALFRE
PLISKE, DAVID ALAN
PLOTT, THOMAS EDWARD II
PLUMPTON, ADAM
MICHAEL
POLESZINSKI, PATRICK
RONALD
POLICKOSKI, JAMES
THOMAS
POOLE, JOHN VERNON
POTOCHNIAK, STEVEN
NIKOLAI
POURAGHABAGHER, REZA
PRALL, MICHAEL EDWARD
PRETE, TONY ALEXANDER
PRICE, JOSHUA DAVID
PRIEUR, THOMAS JAMES
PRIGGE, KARL FREDERICK
PROCTOR, BRIAN CHARLES
PROVENCER, MATTHEW
THOMAS
PURCELL, MICHAEL
ANDREW
QUARLES, JOHN THOMAS
QUIMBY, SARAH RUTH
RADONICH, RICK
MARSHALL
RAINES, GERALD JAYSON
RAMIREZ, JAMES ROY
RAO, KARIN Y
RAUCHENSTEIN, WERNER
JOHANN JR.
RAUSCHER, JAMES
FRANKLIN
RAYNDAL, ELIZABETH
BELDEN
REAGAN, MICHAEL JON
REAM, TOBY ERIC
REED, CHAD BYRON
REGISTER, JEFFREY
RAYMOND
REILLEY, JOHN KENNETH
REYES, MARK
CHRISTOPHER
REYNOLDS, THOMAS
STEVEN
RHODES, JOHN MARK
RICE, ALBERT EVERETT
RICH, JASON ALEXANDER
RICH, JEREMY
CHRISTOPHER
RICHARDS, JUTIN BLAIR
RICHMOND, BENJAMIN
PAUL
RIES, BRIAN EDWARD
RIVERA, GREGORY SCOTT
ROBERTO, STEVEN
CARMINE, JR.
ROBINSON, BRUCE
FRAZIER, II
ROBINSON, JOHN PHILIPSE,
III
ROBLES, MICHAEL PAUL
ROCKWELL, BRAD WILLIAM
RODI, BRADLEY MICHAEL
ROETZ, ERICH PAUL
ROODZANT, STEVEN
EDWARD
ROSALES, ROBERT JOSEPH

ROSS, REY RAIL
ROYAL, GEOFFREY
STERLING
RUBEL, MICHAEL JON, JR.
RUDELLA, JOHN CHARLES
RUE, JOHN PAUL HARRIS
RUIZ, ANDREW MICHAEL
RUMPH, SAMUEL CONRAD,
III
RUSNAK, JOHN JOSEPH
RUSSELL, JONATHAN CARL
SABIN, GLEN EDWARD
SAHLIN, JOHN PATRICK
SAKRYD, GREGORY ALAN
SALING, MICHAEL SCOTT
SALONGA, COLLEEN CHRIS
SANFIELD, DAVID MICHAEL
SANTOMAURO, JOSEPH
MICHAEL, JR.
SANTO, CATHERINE
MENDOZA
SASSE, DOUGLAS WILLIAM,
III
SAUNDERS, AKANE
SAXTON, SAMANTHA JULIA
SAY, ANNE LORRAINE
SCANGO, KIMBERLEY
ELLEN
SCHARCK, TIMOTHY
ANDREW
SCHILKE, RICHARD ALAN
SCHLESINGER, DAVID
JOSEPH
SCHMIDT, ANDREW DAVID
SCHMIDT, KEVIN JAMES
SCHMIDT, THOMAS DAVID
SCHNEIDER, MICHAEL ERIC
SCHOWE, CYNTHIA ANN
SCHULTZ, JOHN PAUL
SCHULTZ, KARL ULRICH
SCHWARTZ, SUSAN
SCOTT, JEFFREY MICHAEL
SCRITCHFIELD, RICHARD
IRVIN JR.
SIEBERGER, MICHAEL
SHEEHAN
SEIDENSTICKER, DANIEL
FRANKLIN
SEIPT, MATTHEW KARL
WILLIAMS
SELF, DOUGLAS LEO
SELFBRIDGE, GREGORY
EUGENE
SEOANE, STEVEN MICHAEL
SEYFARTH, SCOTT ROBERT
SHAFFER, DAVID KIMBER
SHARPE, JOHN FORREST
SHIELDS, JONATHAN
JAMES
SHIN, DANIEL MINSOK
SHROPSHIRE, KENNETH
WAYNE JR.
SHUMAN, MAXWELL
JENKINS
SIEBERT, ERIC WILLIAM
SILINSKY, KEITH RICHARD
SILVA, JUAN ALEJANDRO
SIMPSON, TYREL TROY
SINES, MARY BETH
SINGLETON, THOMAS WADE
SINGS, CHARLES WILLIAM
SITLOW, BRIAN LYNN
SIVILLO, VINCENT PATRICK
SKARIAH, SATISH
SKELLY, JOHN JAMES
SKINNER, QUINN DAVID
SLAUGHT, JAMES CARROLL
SLAKES, RICHARD JAY
SMART, KEVIN MICHAEL
SMART, SCOTT DAVID
SMITH, DAVID MICHAEL
SMITH, JACK GERARD
SMITH, JOSEPH PATRICK
SMITH, NATASHA LEIGH
SMITH, OTIS BENTON III
SMITH, QUWAN ANTHONY
SMITH, WALTER VINCENT
SMULLE, DAVID RENE
SNEERINGER, TIMOTHY
BERNARD
SNIDER, CHESLEY DAVID
SNYDER, CHAD
CHRISTOPHER
SNYDER, CRAIG MATTHEW
SOHOVICH, ROBERT
MICHAEL
SOLBERT, TROY ALLEN
SOUZA, DAVID MICHAEL
SPENCER, MICHAEL TIPTON
SPICER, TIMOTHY CURTISS
SPRADLING, BROCK
ANDREW
SPRAGUE, STEPHEN OWEN
SPRUNGLE, JAMES ROBERT
III
SRAY, KAREN LYNNE
STANLEY, BRUCE RICHARD
JR.
STAUD, JOSEPH MICHAEL
STAVISH, DAVID JOSEPH
STERBIS, CHRISTOPHER
JAMES

STEVENS, JOHN
DAVENPORT
STILL, JONATHAN LYLE
STILLIE, CHRISTOPHER
TOBIAS
STOPHA, JULIE ANN
STOREY, THOMAS DANIEL
STROUD, KEVIN JAY
STUBBLEFIELD, JOHN
MITCHELL
STULL, MICHAEL DAVID
SUBER, WILLIAM ERIC
SULLIVAN, FARRELL
JOSEPH
SULLIVAN, MICHAEL
THUCO
SULLIVAN, RICHARD
JAMES
SUMMERS, MICHAEL
PHILLIP
SUMNER, CHRISTOPHER
ANTHONY
SWEENEY, SHAWN PATRICK
SWEET, BRETT CAMERON
SWISHER, DOUGLAS LEE
TALBOT, KEVIN
CHRISTOPHER
TALICURAN, BRIAN
SALAMAT
TALLANT, SHANE PATRICK
TAN, JOHN TORIBIO
TANGNEY, PATRICK JOHN
TANKERSLEY, MARK
WARNER
TAPLIN, ANDREA
ELIZABETH
TAYLOR, SCOTT THOMAS
TEHAN, KEVIN GERHARD
TELLIER, AARON THOMAS
TESSIN, CRAIG RONALD
TESTERMAN, MATTHEW
ALLEN
THAYER, MATTHEW KIM
THIEL, MICHAEL JOSEPH
THOMAS, ROBERT SCOTT
THOMPSON, ROBERT
SAMUEL
THORP, JONATHAN
MACGREGOR
TIERNEY, JOHN ANTHONY
TILMAN, SHANNON JAMES
TO, LUAN KIM
TODD, JEFFREY SCOTT
TOLG, JOHN DAVID
TOOLE, JAMES HUGH
TRANTHAM, JOEL CLAY
TRICHE, ERNEST JOSEPH
IV
TROYER, SCOTT STEPHEN
TRUITT, JEFFREY JAMES
TSANGARIS, GEORGE
NICHOLAS
TULODIESKI, CHRISTIAN
MATTHEW
TURCO, KYLE TRAVIS
TURKOVICH, CHRISTOPHER
ANDREW
TUTTLE, MEGHAN
ISINGARD
TYMOSCHENKO, VOLODJA
AKIRA
UBIAL, KENNETH ARDONA
ULAK, ANDREW FRANK
ULISSEY, STACIA AGNES
ULMER, TIMOTHY MARK
VALLAZZA, LOURDES
PATRICIA
VALLHONRAT,
CHRISTOPHER LAWRENCE
VAN BUREN, EDWARD
MORRIS, IV
VAN NATTA, JACK RONALD
VAN SCHOOENEVELD,
COURTNEY LEE
VANDEGRIFT, TODD
DOUGLAS
VANNOY, MARK
ALEXANDER

VERDUCCI, FRANK
MICHAEL, JR.
VIDENA, JOHN RIVI RAMOS
VIERNES, CYNTHIA
DOMINGO
VIETOR, OLIVER
RANDOLPH
WILLEMEZ, LILLIAN LYNN
VINCENTO, FREDRICK
SALVATORE
WAGGONER, MEGAN JEAN
WAGGONER, WILLIAM
ROBERT
WAGLE, MATTHEW LYNN
WAGNER, DENNIS JAMES
WAHLIN, CHAD GORDON
WAIS, JAMES ROY, JR.
WALDRON, JASON ERIC
WALKER, GARY ALAN
WALLACE, ARTHUR
WILLIAM, JR.
WALLACE, TANYA LYNN
WALTHALL, BRYAN
EDWARD
WALZ, CHARLES
FREDERICK, IV
WANDER, KJELL ANDREW
WARTTELL, JASON DAVID
WASHBURN, TODD ANDREW
WATHEN, JASON THOMAS
WEBER, MATTHEW IAN
WEDERTZ, ROBERT
WILLIAM
WEEKS, TODD SINCLAIR
WEDNER, GLENN ALAN, II
WEIS, ROBERT AARON
WEICH, MARK
CHRISTOPHER, SR.
WELSH, MATTHEW HUNTER
WESLEY, CURTIS LEONUS,
JR.
WESLEY, THOMAS WAYNE
WESSMAN, DEREK SCOTT
WHALEN, SCOTT RICHARD
WHITE, BEAUREGARD
MOSELEY
WHITE, BENJAMIN
WOODRIFFE
WHITEHEAD, DAVID GLENN
WHITELEY, RICHARD
STEFAN
WHITEWAY, JEFFREY
JENNINGS
WIENDL, JOSEPH ARTHUR,
IV
WIESE, CLIFFORD TODD
WILLIAMS, ANDREW
GREGORY
WILLIAMS, CLAY GARRETT
WILLIAMS, ERNIE S.
WILLIAMS, JEROMY BOONE
WILLS, EDWARD JOSEPH
WILSON, CHEYENNE DANIEL
WILSON, GREGORY JAMES
WINTER, ERIC STEVEN
WIRTH, CRAIG CAMERON
WISE, JONATHAN REDDING
WOLFERSBERGER,
MICHAEL TRENT
WOLFF, DENISE ELLEN
WOODRUFF, EUGENE
MATTHEW
WRIGHT, GEOFFREY
AUSTIN
WRYE, WALTER CLARK, IV
WYPYSKI, THOMAS PETER
YATES, JEFFREY BOYD
YEPEZ, LUIS ENRIQUE, JR.
YORK, CHRISTOPHER PAUL
YOUNG, LAURENCE MARTIN
YOUNG, PATRICK EARL
YUN, JOSEPH JOOHO
ZAHNEN, KURT JACOB
ZALLNICK, TIFFANY MARIE
ZERPHY, MATTHEW DAVID
ZINK, MICHAEL FREDERICK

BROWN, HENRY D. X...
BROWN, JULIE L. X...
BROWN, TERRANCE M. XX...
BROWN, WILLIAM I. X...
BRUNNSCHWEILER, STEFAN T. X...
BUTTERS, JUSTIN X...
CALERO, CARLOS A. X...
CAMPBELL, JOHN R. X...
CARNEVALE, ROBERT S. X...
CARPENTER, CLIFTON B. X...
CATLIN, CHRISTOPHER G. X...
CESTA, MICHAEL A. XX...
CHATLOS, GEORGE C. XX...
CHECKLEY, WINFIELD E. X...
CHO, MICHAEL M. X...
CLARK, CHRISTOPHER L. XX...
CLEMENT, GARY A. X...
COLEMAN, LAWRENCE C. XX...
CONSTANT, DOUGLAS L. X...
CONWAY, SCOTT E. X...
COOPER, SCOTT A. X...
COTTRELL, SHOGG J. X...
CRAWFORD, LONNIE L. XX...
CRESPIN, AARON L. X...
CREVIER, JUSTIN C. X...
DEEN, JAMES D. XX...
DELAZARO, STEVEN J. X...
DEPU, WILLIAM L. XX...
DOBBINS, THOMAS M. XX...
DOUGHTY, PETER M. X...
DURDIN, JEFFREY J. XX...
DwyER, BRIAN M. XX...
ELDRIDGE, ERIK B. X...
ELLIS, JAMES B. X...
ERWIN, JAMES E. X...
ESCAMILLA, CHRISTOPHER R. X...
EWING, JOHN R. XX...
FAGAN, KELLY A. XX...
FALLS, ROBERT J. X...
FALKENBACH, ROBERT W. XX...
FARRINGTON, KEVIN M. XX...
FITZPATRICK, ANDREW I. XX...
GEE, GRACE S. X...
GORDON, PHILLIP M. X...
GORE, THOMAS D. XX...
GRAVES, CHRISTOPHER T. X...
GRAY, JEREMY L. XX...
GRENE, MICHAEL E. X...
GROTH, MICHAEL E. X...
HAGEN, TERRY D. X...
HALVERSON, JON L. X...
HAND, TERRANCE E. X...
HANNIGAN, CASEY E. XX...
HARRIS, KEVIN C. X...
HERNANDEZ, ERIC L. X...
HERON, WINSTON A. X...
HETLAND, JON S. X...
HILL, KARL E. X...
HIMELSPACH, STEVEN J. X...
HITTLE, PATRICK R. XX...
HOLLAND, AARON B. X...
HOLTEN, ADAM Y. X...
HOUTING, DANIEL J. X...
HUBER, MIKE R. X...
JIMENEZ, WINSTON G. X...
JONES, CALEB L. X...
KARCZEWSKI, NORBERT J. X...
KARN, THOMAS M. XX...
KELLY, MATTHEW G. XX...
KOHMUECH, WILLIAM S. XX...
KOLICH, MATTHEW J. XX...
KOROL, GEORGE L. X...
LARSON, BRENT L. X...
LEE, WALTER S. X...
LEGGETT, MARGERY A. X...
LEHMANN, ANDREW T. XX...
LEWIS, BRANDON K. XX...
LEWIS, TYSON C. X...
LIANEZ, RAUL X...
LINLEY, JASON C. X...
MADDOCKS, JASON J. XX...
MANSFIELD, SHAWN E. X...
MARTIN, JON G. X...
MARUCCI, ANTHONY J. X...
MAYBACH, JOSEPH E. X...
MCCAULEY, TODD L. X...
MCCULLY, WILLIAM S. XX...
MCDONIEL, PATRICK S. X...
MCGINNIS, MARK N. XX...
MCMILLEN, MARIA S. X...
MCMILLON, CHESTER X...
MCNULTY, EDWARD D. X...
MEGOWAN, CHARLES F. X...
MIKKOLA, DAVID M. X...
MILANETTE, RO T. X...
MILES, AARON J. X...
MILLER, PAUL W. X...
MINIFIE, CHARLES D. XX...
MITCHELL, JACOB N. X...
MOLLOHAN, MICHAEL S. XX...
MORENO, JOSEPH L. XX...
MOSKAL, ROBERT L. XX...
MURPHY, JAMES D. X...
NEIDIGH, JOHN C. X...
NELMS, CHANDLER S. X...
OLEARY, BRYAN P. X...
OSBORNE, JOHN C. XX...
OWENBY, THOMAS R. X...
PANGELINAN, VAUGHAN M. X...
PATTERSON, BRYAN E. X...
PECK, ERIC A. X...
PELTON, JULIE A. XX...

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE NOMINATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES NAVAL
ACADEMY GRADUATES NAMED HEREIN FOR APPOINT-
MENT IN THE GRADE OF SECOND LIEUTENANT WHICH
WERE SENT TO THE SENATE ON 24 MAY 1993.

NAVAL ACADEMY MIDSHIPMEN

To be second lieutenant; permanent

ABRAHAM, ARNOUX X...
ALQUEZA, LODGERIO B. X...
BALET, EDWARD W. XX...
BARRANCO, JOHN B. JR. X...
BARTON, ARA E. XX...
BASIL, SHAWN A. XX...
BAULIG, DANIEL T. X...
BERARDI, CLAY A. XX...
BERNSTEIN, PAUL G. X...
BERRY, CHARLES T. X...
BLAYLOCK, BRIAN R. XX...
BOLDEN, ANTHONY C. X...
BOWER, MATTHEW H. X...
BROWN, BENJAMIN J. X...

PETERS, MARK W. xx...
 PETERSEN, RICHARD B. xx...
 PETERSON, ROBERT S. xx...
 PLATZ, DARRELL W. xx...
 POLIDORO, JOHN R. xx...
 PRITCHARD, JAMES A. xx...
 PRITCHETT, THOMAS L. xx...
 PROCTOR, BRIAN C. xx...
 PURCELL, MICHAEL A. xx...
 QUANN, JAMES T. xx...
 QUIGLY, SEAN P. xx...
 QUIMBY, SARAH R. xx...
 RAMPEY, TODD P. xx...
 RAYFIELD, WILLIAM P. xx...
 REITTER, NORMAN L. xx...
 REUTER, MATTHEW B. xx...
 RICHMOND, BENJAMIN P. xx...
 ROPELLA, ERIC J. xx...
 SABER, DOUGLAS J. xx...
 SABET, SASAN K. xx...
 SCHERER, KURT J. xx...
 SCHIEFELBEIN, PETER K. xx...

SCHILKE, RICHARD A. xx...
 SCHIMPF, PAUL M. xx...
 SCHNELLE, JAMES A. xx...
 SCHRODER, ROBERT W. xx...
 SCHUYLER, JOSEPH R. xx...
 SCIALABBA, SAMUEL S. xx...
 SEDWICK, MARK W. xx...
 SEIPT, MATTHEW K. xx...
 SMITH, CHARLES E. xx...
 SMITH, COLIN D. xx...
 SMITH, SAMUEL H. xx...
 SMULLEN, DAVID R. xx...
 SOBKOWSKI, MICHAEL J. xx...
 STEVENSON, JEFFREY T. xx...
 SULLIVAN, FARRELL J. xx...
 TANDY, DAVID E. xx...
 TAYLOR, JONATHAN P. xx...
 TAYLOR, MICHAEL C. xx...
 TEHAN, KEVIN G. xx...
 TEN KLEY, MONTE D. xx...
 TOWNSEND, PERRY R. xx...
 TURNER, JOHN xx...

TURNER, TROY J. xx...
 VAVASSEUR, DAVID A. xx...
 VILLALOBOS, LUIS E. xx...
 WAGLE, MATTHEW L. xx...
 WALDRON, JASON E. xx...
 WALLACE, JOHN R. xx...
 WALTERS, MATTHEW S. xx...
 WANG, AUSTIN xx...
 WEATHERS, WALTER T. xx...
 WELBORN, THOMAS A. xx...
 WELCH, MARK xx...
 WENTZ, MICHAEL xx...
 WIEBE, JACOB J. xx...
 WILLIAMS, DAVID H. xx...
 WILSON, GREGORY J. xx...
 WINKLOSKY, DEVIN A. xx...
 WIRTH, CRAIG C. xx...
 WYLIE, JAY D. xx...
 YARGER, JOHN W. xx...
 YOUNG, CHARLES W. xx...
 ZOLLMANN, JAY K. xx...